

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 07096620 5



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation



The Irish Ecclesiastical Record

A Monthly Journal under Episcopal Sanction

VOLUME XIX

JANUARY to JUNE, 1922

FIFTH SERIES

DUBLIN

BROWNE AND NOLAN, LIMITED, NASSAU STREET

1922

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

DEC - 5 1953

Nihil Obstat :

TERENTIUS O'DONNELL, S.T.D.,
Censor Dep.

Imprimi potest :

✠ **EDUARDUS,**
Archiep. Dublinen.,
Hiberniae Primas.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XIX

ARTICLES

	PAGE
Art for Art's Sake	382
By Peter M'Brien	
Benson's Character, The Ruling Trait of	29
By Rev. James F. Cassidy	
Canons-Regular of Prémontré, The (1120-1920)	128
By Rev. Philip Hughes	
Catholic Lending Libraries	561
By Rev. M. H. MacInerny, O.P.	
Catholics and Evolution Theories	614
By Rev. H. V. Gill, S.J., M.A., M.Sc.	
Church in France, After Fifteen Years of Separation, The	493
By Stephen Brown, S.J.	
Church in Sweden, The Vicissitudes of the	389
By Rev. M. Gibbons, S.T.L.	
Clerical Economist, A : The Rev. Philip Skelton	15
By Rev. E. J. Quigley	
Diabolical Possession, Some Modern Cases of	365
By Rev. Herbert V. O'Neill	
Eternal Life	113, 234, 344, 460
By Right Rev. John S. Vaughan, D.D., Bishop of Sebastopolis	
Father Thomas White, Founder of the Irish College, Salamanca	578
By Right Rev. D. J. O'Doherty, D.D.	
Fermanagh, The Chieftains of	1, 598
By Rev. Paul Walsh, M.A.	
Geraldines, One of the Homes of the Southern (Cluan Castle)	177
By J. B. Cullen	
Hugh Roe O'Donnell's Sisters	858
By Rev. Paul Walsh, M.A.	
Immaculate Conception, The Eve of the	61, 147
By Rev. F. O'Neill	
Irish Artists, Some Celebrated	625
By Rev. E. A. Foran, O.S.A.	
Irish Monetary History, Studies in	172, 274
By Rev. Dom P. Nolan, O.S.B., M.A.	
Irish Nuns of Lisbon, The : Our Lady of Bom Sucesso	225
By Right Rev. Mgr. D. J. O'Doherty	
Is Temptation Ever Irresistible ?	262
By Rev. David Barry	
Journalism, The Ethics of	514
By Rev. David Barry	

Malachy's Prophecy of the Eucharistic Sacrifice	503
By Rev. E. F. Sutcliffe, S.J.	
Mass, The Meaning of the	449
By Rev. Garrett Pierse, D.D.	
Missionary Fathers of the Most Holy Sacrament: An Irish Indigenous Congregation	43
By W. H. Grattan-Flood, Mus.D., K.S.G.	
Missionary Nun of Early Christian Ireland, A: St. Modenna . .	36
By J. B. Cullen	
Parable of the Unjust Steward, The	337
By Rev. P. Boylan, M.A.	
St. Patrick, The Genealogy of	476
By Rev. Michael T. MacSweeney	
Souper Problem, A Postscript on the	246
By Rev. M. H. MacInerny, O.P.	
Temptation and Sin	51
By Rev. David Barry	
Vocation: Its Essential Elements	165
By Rev. John Kearney, C.S.Sp.	
When Was Our Lord Born?	284
By Rev. L. Cardwell, S.J.	

CONTRIBUTORS

BARRY, REV. DAVID—Temptation and Sin	51
— Is Temptation Ever Irresistible?	262
— The Ethics of Journalism	514
BOYLAN, REV. P., M.A.—The Parable of the Unjust Steward . .	337
BROWN, STEPHEN, S.J.—The Church in France After Fifteen Years of Separation	493
CARDWELL, REV. L., S.J.—When Was Our Lord Born?	284
CASSIDY, REV. JAMES F.—The Ruling Trait of Benson's Character .	29
CULLEN, J. B.—A Missionary Nun of Early Christian Ireland: St. Modenna	36
— One of the Homes of the Southern Geraldines: Cluan Castle .	177
EATON, REV. M., B.D., B.C.L.—Liturgy	201, 315, 416, 541, 649
FORAN, REV. E. A.—Some Celebrated Irish Artists	625
GIBBONS, REV. M., S.T.L.—The Vicissitudes of the Church in Sweden .	389
GILL, REV. H. V., S.J., M.A., M.Sc.—Catholics and Evolution Theories .	614
GRATTAN-FLOOD, W. H., Mus.D., K.S.G.—Missionary Fathers of the Most Holy Sacrament	43
HUGHES, REV. PHILIP—The Canons-Regular of Prémontre	128
KEARNEY, REV. JOHN, C.S.SP.—Vocation: Its Essential Elements . .	165
KINANE, REV. J., D.C.L.—Canon Law	194, 308, 409, 533, 642
M'BRIEN, PETER—Art for Art's Sake	382
MACINERNY, REV. M. H., O.P.—A Postscript on the Souper Problem .	246
— Catholic Lending Libraries	561
MACSWEENEY, REV. MICHAEL T.—The Genealogy of St. Patrick . .	476
NOLAN, REV. DOM P., O.S.B., M.A.—Studies in Irish Monetary History .	172, 274
O'DOHERTY, RIGHT REV. MGR. D. J.—The Irish Nuns of Lisbon: Our Lady of Bom Successo	225
— Father Thomas White, Founder of the Irish College, Salamanca .	578

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XIX

V

	PAGE
O'DONNELL, REV. M. J., D.D.—Theology	185, 302, 401, 527, 635
O'NEILL, REV. F.—The Eve of the Immaculate Conception	61, 147
O'NEILL, REV. HERBERT V.—Some Modern Cases of Diabolical Possession	365
PIERSE, REV. GARRETT, D.D.—The Meaning of the Mass	449
QUIGLEY, REV. E. J.—A Clerical Economist	15
SUTCLIFFE, REV. E. F., S.J.—Malachy's Prophecy of the Eucharistic Sacrifice	503
VAUGHAN, RIGHT REV. JOHN S., D.D., Bishop of Sebastopolis—Eternal Life	113, 234, 344, 460
WALSH, REV. PAUL, M.A.—The Chieftains of Fermanagh	1, 598
— Hugh Roe O'Donnell's Sisters	358

NOTES AND QUERIES

Theology :

By Rev. Prof. M. J. O'DONNELL, D.D.

Are all First Communicants bound to Confess ?	404
Assistance at Mass	401
— — — A Recent Reply	635
Boycotting and Exclusive Dealing	527
Commutation of Vows	636
Fast in Baptism	305
— on Holy Saturday	302
Goods sent on Approval	531
Implicit Dispensation, An	303
Indulgence, Loss of	305
Irish Matrimonial Faculties	528
Marriage Case	638
Mass Honoraria and Local Obligations	188
— — — Decision regarding	189
— — — The Ownership of	527
Presumed Death	306
Protestants and Sacramental Absolution	185
Religious as Sponsors	305
Restitution	403
Returned Subscription	639

Canon Law :

By Rev. Prof. J. KINANE, D.C.L.

A Bishop's Power to Order the Application of Mass for a Definite Intention viewed in the light of Recent Decisions of the Congregation of the Council	308, 533
Are Heretics and Schismatics bound by Ecclesiastical Laws ?	648
Can a Bishop permit a Parish Priest to take a 'Honorarium' for a 'Second Mass' and for a Mass on a Retrenched Holiday ?	415
Clerics and Dancing	194
Does Illegitimacy prevent Admission to the Religious Life ?	540
Ecclesiastical Property, The Vesting of	312
New Decrees	197
Novitiate, The Second Year of the	647
Penal Laws, The Possibility and Existence of Purely	642
Pious Foundations, The Consent of the Ordinary necessary for the Acceptation of	312

CANON LAW—*continued*.

Powers of a Superiress over her Subjects, Some Questions in regard to the	314
Quasi-Domicile and Offerings	409
Right of a Priest to remain in the Diocese in which he is Incardinated, The	196
Vernacular Translations of Epistles and Gospels for Sundays	311

Liturgy :

By Rev. M. EATON, B.D., B.C.L.

Absolution 'super Tumulum,' Obligation of the	420
Approval of New Masses and Offices	205
Baptism, A Rubric of	420
Benediction during the 'Forty Hours' and the 'Divine Praises'	654
Benediction Service, Rubric of the	315
Blessing of the Miraculous Medal and a Tabernacle, The	315
Commemorations in a Votive Mass	201
Confession for the First Friday	319
Devotion of the 'Forty Hours' beginning on Passion Sunday, The	544
Feast of the Patron, Transfer of the outward Solemnity attaching to the Celebration of the	416
Indulgences of a Crucifix, Beads, a Prayer, and Stations of the Cross, Queries regarding	649
Litany of Loretto, The	318
Marriage Ceremony within the Sanctuary	315
Mission, Peculiar Ceremony in connexion with a	418
'Oratio imperata' in the Mass, Queries regarding the	201
'Pia Unio,' A Privilege of the	318
Recitation of the Sequence, The new Rubric <i>re</i> the	201
Requiem on Ash Wednesday and on a Sunday	418
Responsories of the 1st Nocturn during Lent	544
Stations of the Cross, Transference of	319
Use of the Stole at the Rosary and Funerals, The	318
Veil of the Tabernacle, The	541

CORRESPONDENCE

Compilation of Parish Histories	75
By Very Rev. J. W. Canon Brady	
Funeral Offerings	206
By 'Alter Dubius'	
O Donnell's Daughter, Mary	656
By Rev. Paul Walsh, M.A.	
The Perry Pictures	656
By Rev. P. A. Beecher, D.D., M.A.	

DOCUMENTS

Allocution of the Holy Father at the Sacred Consistory held on November 21, 1921	96
Apostolic Letter to the Moderator of the Seminary of Ducenta in Campania, congratulating him on his work for the Foreign Missions	219

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XIX

vii

FIGE

Blessed Andrew Franchi, Bishop, Confirmation of the immemorial Cult of the Servant of God	435
Cathedral Chapter, Decision regarding the right of a Canon Coadjutor to Preside at a	430
Clerics and Hunting, The Bishop's Power to inflict Penalties for Violation of Canon 138 of the New Code <i>re</i>	78
Congregations under Diocesan Jurisdiction, Doubts regarding the Celebration of the General Chapter in case of	81
Declaration of the Sacred Congregation of Religious to Moderators and Superiors of Religious Orders concerning the Revision of their Constitution, as prescribed by Decree of June 26, 1918	103
Dr. Nivard Schlögl of the Order of Cistercians, A Work of, is put on the Index of Prohibited Books	329
Extensive Faculties for Five Years obtainable on Application to the Holy See by the Ordinaries of Europe (Italy and Russia excepted)	552
Funeral Offerings in neighbouring Parishes, Decision regarding the Claim of a certain Cathedral Chapter to	98
Holy City, A new College for the Foreign Missions is erected in the	434
John Neumann, Bishop of Philadelphia, Decree regarding the Beatification and Canonization of the Venerable Servant of God	664
Leonardo Murialdo, Founder of the Pious Society of St. Joseph, Decree regarding the Beatification and Canonization of the Servant of God	437
Letter of His Holiness, Benedict XV, to Cardinal Vannutelli, concerning the Solemn Tribute to be paid to the Memory of the Great Musician, John Pierluigi of Palestrina	83
— — — to Cardinal Schulte, Archbishop of Cologne, regarding the Founding of an Institute of Catholic Philosophy	84
— — — to the Hierarchy of Czechoslovakia, exhorting them to take Counsel for the Proper Education and Discipline of the Clergy	210
— — — of the Holy See to the Apostolic Delegate of the East Indies	217
Litany of Loretto, Doubt regarding the Recitation of the	221
— — — of the Saints, The Sacred Congregation of Rites orders a new Invocation to be added to the	556
Mass Stipends, Decree regarding the Discharge of Obligations arising from	76
— — — Decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Council regarding the Transference of	101
'Missionalis Cleri Consociatio,' Circular Letter from the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide concerning the First International Convention of the, to be held at Rome in June	660
Novitiate, Instruction of the Sacred Congregation of Religious regarding the Second Year of the	104
Oration on the Election of a Supreme Pontiff, delivered by R. P. Aurelio Galli after the Mass of the Holy Ghost preparatory to the recent Conclave	422
Panegyric on the late Pope Benedict XV, delivered on the last day of the Obsequies by the Most Rev. D. Pacificio Marsella	322
'Pia Unio Cleri,' Privilege of anticipating Matins and Lauds granted to Members of the	221
'Pia Unio Eucharistica Reparatrix,' An increase on Indulgences is granted to the Pious Union entitled, established in the City of Milan	662

	PAGE
Pius XI, The Election of the Supreme Pontiff	426
— Apostolic Indulgences granted by, on 17th February, 1922	428
— Autograph Letter of, to the Archbishop of Genoa, on the International Peace Conference held in that city	659
— <i>Motu Proprio</i> of, regulating the Procedure on the Occasion of a Conclave for the Election of a Pope	661
— Table of the Chief Events in the Life of our present Holy Father	428
Presumption of Death in a Matrimonial Case	327
Revenues of a certain Chaplaincy, Decision of the Holy Roman Rota regarding the	87
Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda, Circular Letter to all Bishops from the, on the Third Centenary of its Foundation,	214
Sanctuary of Our Lady of the Assumption on Mount Alverna is Honoured with the Title of Minor Basilica, The	82
Society of Priests of San' Sulpice, A Perpetual Faculty of Ruling and Administering Seminaries is granted to the	326
Statement issued by the Cardinal Primate and the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland on the Present Condition of their Country	547
Thursday following the Octave of Corpus Christi, A proper Mass and Office of 'The Most Sacred Eucharistic Heart of Jesus' for the, are approved by the Sacred Congregation of Rites	209
Universal Calendar, Four New Feasts, with proper Offices and Masses, are added to the	106
University of Lublin (Poland), The Catholic, is Canonically erected and its Statutes approved	86
— of Warsaw, A Catholic Faculty of Ecclesiastical Sciences is Canonically erected in the	85
Vulgate, The, Declaration of the Pontifical Biblical Commission regarding the addition of Various Readings in Editions of	667

REVIEWS AND NOTES

'Art of Interesting, The—Its Theory and Practice,' 670; 'Book of Saints, The,' 333; 'Catholic Evidence Movement, The,' 333; 'Clerical Student, The,' 558; 'Daughters of Banba,' 669; 'Ethics—General and Special,' 441; 'Evolution and Social Progress,' 446; 'God's Wonder Book,' 447; 'Handbook of Patrology, A,' 444; 'Institutiones Theologicae Naturales,' 330; 'Ireland—Elements of Her Early Story,' 108; 'Jesuits, The,' 558; 'Jesus Christ, The King of Hearts,' 111; 'Life's Lessons,' 110; 'Little Flowers of St. Francis, The,' 335; 'Materials for the History of the Franciscan Province of Ireland—A.D. 1230-1450,' 222; 'Mill Town Pastor, A—The Story of a Witty and Valiant Priest,' 109; 'Moral Principles and Medical Practice,' 445; 'On My Keeping and in Theirs,' 334; 'Path of Humility, The,' 110; 'Parochial Course of Doctrinal Instructions for all Sundays and Holydays of the Year, A,' 444; 'Prayer—The Great Means of Salvation,' 447; 'Rebuilding a Lost Faith,' 335; 'St. John Berchmans,' 109; 'St. Patrick,' 443; 'Story of Lourdes, The,' 671; 'Thoth—The Hermes of Egypt,' 668; 'Your Own Heart,' 110; Books, etc., received, 112, 224, 336, 448, 560, 672.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD

THE CHIEFTAINS OF FERMANAGH

BY REV. PAUL WALSH, M.A.

III

IN my last paper on this subject, in the I. E. RECORD of June, 1921, reference was made to Cuchonnacht, who had a patent of all Fermanagh in 1586, and died on June 17, 1589. We may now pass to this chief's children. He was father of at least six sons : (1) Aodh, who succeeded in the chieftainship ; (2) Brian, who lived till 1655 ; (3) Toirrdhealbhach ; (4) Cuchonnacht, who died at Genoa in 1608 ; (5) another Toirrdhealbhach ; and (6) Sean, nearly always referred to as Sean an Bharra. Of these sons we shall speak later on. They had, we know for certain, four married sisters. The earliest referred to is she who was wife of Philip O'Reilly.¹ A second was married to Brian Og O Ruairc.² Another survived her husband, Sir Arthur O'Neill, Toirrdhealbhach Luineach's son. In 1602 we hear of a proposal on the part of Niall Garbh O Domhnaill to marry Sir Arthur's widow, ' which done, Maguire were wholly his ' ;³ this means that the lady in question was sister of the then chief Maguire, the young Cuchonnacht. Brian Crosach O'Neill, son of Cormac

¹ ' Philip O'Reilly's wife, Maguire's sister ' (September 27, 1595, *Cal. of Carew Papers*, 236). ' Philip O'Reilly's son by the wife he now hath, being Maguire's sister ' (*Cal. of State Papers*, 1596, 494).

² ' Knowing that O'Rourke had married the sister of Maguire ' (*Cal. of State Papers*, 1598, 130) ; see also *ibid.* 153.

³ *Cal. of State Papers*, 539.

macBaron, was married to a fourth, for we learn from a deposition dated April 12, 1615, that that gentleman had then 'three brothers-in-law, Maguyre's sons.'¹ These three would be Brian, Toirrdhealbhach, and (most likely) Sean an Bharra, for, at that date, Aodh and Cuchonnacht, certainly and one Toirrdhealbhach, probably, were dead.

XV. AODH, son of Cuchonnacht, was the last chieftain duly inaugurated according to ancient Irish custom. According to a passage preserved in the R.I.A. manuscript, c. vi. 1, page 154, he was but a 'young beardless boy' on the occasion of his slaying of a certain Conn O'Neill, in 1586. The exploit is described as 'his first feat of arms.' In the same year his father commends him for executing 'considerable damage' on a body of Scots mercenaries, who had landed at Inishowen, and were on their way to Connacht. After a severe defeat at the Moy, a small number of them escaped, and appear to have had the ill fortune to encounter Hugh Maguire again in the neighbourhood of the Erne.² The chieftainship of Fermanagh becoming vacant in June, 1589, there were rival claimants for the position, members of the two principal houses of the Maguires. Conchobhar Ruadh, of the elder branch, was grandson of one chief, who died in 1527, and nephew of another, deposed in 1540. He was, however, unable to establish himself, for Aodh, the last chief's son, backed by some of the O'Donnells, had himself inaugurated at Sgiath Ghabhra,³ the present town of Lisnaskea. On January 14, 1590-1, Maguidhir was knighted in Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin.⁴ From this fact it appears that the young chieftain then intended to pursue a course of loyalty, as his father before him had done in the closing years of his reign. From such a policy he was soon diverted by the

¹ Meehan, *Fate and Fortunes of O'Neill and O'Donnell*, third edition, 312.

² *Cal. of State Papers*, 1586, 146, 179. Byngham's report that Hugh and Sir Arthur O'Neill aided them on their journey to Connacht (175) can hardly be correct.

³ *Four Masters*.

⁴ *Ulster Journal of Archaeology*, Second Series, iii. 209.

excesses of English officials posted in and around his country of Fermanagh.

At the period we are here concerned with the principal Government officers in Connacht were Sir Richard Byngham, George and John, his brothers, and another George, a cousin. Henry Duke (afterwards knighted) was sheriff in County Cavan from 1584 to 1588, a post in which he was succeeded by Edward Harbert (likewise afterwards knighted).¹ Captain Thomas Henshaw was appointed seneschal of County Monaghan on December 12, 1591.² Captain Humphrey Willis was expelled from the Abbey of Donegal by Hugh Roe O'Donnell, immediately after the latter's escape from the castle of Dublin, in February, 1592.³ On May 8, 1593, there is a complaint that O'Donnell and Maguire have repulsed 'the new sheriff of Maguire's country,' the same Captain Willis.⁴ When Maguire put in a statement of his grievances in January, 1596, he blamed these officials for provoking him to rebellion.⁵ His 'griefs' and his 'submission' are dated January 28 in the *Calendar of the Carew Papers*. They are briefly summarized by Rev. Denis Murphy, S.J., as follows⁶ :—

He took up arms on account of the manner in which his territory had been ravaged by the Bingham, and when he sent letters to the Lord Deputy and Council demanding restitution, and they ordered the Bingham to make amends, these again entered his territory, preyed it, and slew many of the inhabitants. So, too, Henshaw, the seneschal of Monaghan, made incursions, captured and killed men, women, and children. Yet Sir William Fitzwilliam caused no redress to be made. Sir Henry Duke and Sir Edward Herbert, sheriffs of Cavan, did the like. He paid large sums of money as bribes to prevent the charges of sheriffs or other officers; but Captain Willis, with Fuller's band and other companies, was sent to be sheriff, and preyed the country. These hard courses compelled him to entertain forces to repulse the said Willis and his companies; whereupon ensued the proclaiming of himself and his

¹ Fiant of Elizabeth, 4556, 5130, 5361.

² Ibid. 5690.

³ *Cal. of State Papers*, 462.

⁴ Ibid. 96.

⁵ On the other hand, Sir John Dowdall, in an advice sent to Burghley, March 9, 1595-6, alleges that O'Neill made Maguire 'a forerunner of his rebellion' (*Cal. of State Papers*, 485).

⁶ *Life of Hugh Roe*, Introduction, liii.

followers and their banishment out of the country. Moreover, he protested that his disloyalty did not proceed from any conspiracy with any domestic or foreign enemy, or of malice towards her Majesty, but through hard usages.

There is, however, little doubt that Maguire's resolution to go into rebellion was come to as a result of an agreement with Hugh Roe O'Donnell. The chiefs were cousins, and O'Donnell had a safe conduct through Fermanagh following his escape from Dublin Castle on the Eve of the Epiphany, 1591-2.¹ On December 17, 1592, the Governor of Connacht states that O'Rourke's son, Brian Og, 'is maintained and relieved by Hugh Roe O'Donnell and Maguire upon the borders of Connaught, but without my government, and only comes into the Brenny by starts when they send aid with him.'² The same writer charges these chiefs, on March 13, 1593, with despatching intelligence to Spain.³ The next month the Government learned from an informer that 'O'Donnell and Maguire are joined together against the Queen by the procurement of the Earl of Tyrone.'⁴ Sir Hugh Magennis reports to the same effect on April 25,⁵ and on May 8, Mr. Ralph Lane reports to Burghley that 'O'Donnell and Maguire, having repulsed the new sheriff of Maguire's country, came with 1500 men to the borders of Connaught to stir the people to rebellion.'⁶ The State Papers, therefore, confirm O'Clery's assertion⁷ that Maguire had an

¹ *Life of Aodh Ruadh O Domhnaill* (ed. Walsh), § 16. Writers who follow Father Murphy's version of O'Clery's narrative of O'Donnell's escape, cannot but give a wrong date for the event. O'Clery says the young prince was in prison 'till Epiphany Eve, 1592'—*go hoidhche nolltlaice stell do shonnradh anno 1592*. Father Murphy wrongly understands *nolltlaice stell* as 'Christmas.' Yet, in spite of his own translation, page 19, he says, on page xxviii. of his book, that O'Donnell escaped on Christmas Eve, 1591. In this he is followed by, among others, Mrs. H. Concannon (*I. E. RECORD*, Sept., 1920, p. 230). O'Sullivan, *Hist. Cath.* (1621), folio 125, differs from O'Clery as to the precise date. He says: 'tempus erat hybernum paucis diebus ante dominici natalis festum.' But the writers I have referred to profess to follow O'Clery.

² *Cal. of State Papers*, 38. ⁵ *Ibid.* 95.

³ *Ibid.* 81. ⁶ *Ibid.* 96.

⁴ *Ibid.* 94 (April 29). ⁷ *Life*, § 30.

understanding with O Donnell when he launched into rebellion in the middle of 1593.

Before dealing with some matters connected with Maguire's campaigns, it may be remarked that this chief married one of the Earl of Tyrone's daughters in this same year, 1593. The Lord Deputy had heard a report of the match on May 17,¹ and a document of the previous month has a marginal note in Burghley's hand to the effect that Maguire was married to a 'filia Comitis,' a daughter of the Earl of Tyrone.² There is no indication as to what name this lady bore. She was, most likely, the mother of Maguire's three sons, Sean Ruadh, Aodh, and Emonn.

The signal for the revolt of the North was the expulsion of Captain Humphrey Willis and his troops out of Fermanagh.³ O Sullivan ascribes the outbreak of Maguire to a charge preferred against him of burning in his house an English official who was quartered in the abbey of Clones.⁴ The first attack was directed against the County Sligo and the castle of Ballymote, where Sir George Byngham, Sir Richard's brother, was in command. The raid was executed by a force of 1,100 men, under Sean an Bharra and his cousin Donnchadh Og Maguire, and was completely successful, Ballymote being burned and a large prey taken. Maguire despatched an account of his victory to the Earl of Tyrone. It fell into the hands of Turlough Luineach O'Neill, who promptly delivered it to the Government. At the same time Maguire besought Angus Mac Donnell for reinforcements of men in view of 'some wars rising upon him.'⁵ O Clery disposes of this expedition in a single sentence,⁶ while O Sullivan merely says that 'Maguire plundered a few of those English who held Connacht.'⁷

¹ *Cal. of State Papers*, 98.

² *Ibid.* 95.

³ Fynes Moryson, ii. 188; *Cal. of State Papers*, 112, 148.

⁴ *Historia Catholica*, tom. 3, bk. 2, ch. 6.

⁵ *Cal. of State Papers*, 105, 113, 114.

⁶ *Life*, § 30.

⁷ *Historia Catholica*, tom. 3, bk. 2, ch. 6.

Nevertheless, this raid was of great importance. Maguire suddenly appeared in Machaire Connacht, in County Roscommon, on June 23–July 3, and, in consequence of the concentration of the English forces in County Sligo, administered a sharp defeat to Sir Richard Byngham in the neighbourhood of Tulsk. Certain notables on Maguire's side were slain, including Edmond Macgauran, Primate of Armagh, the Abbot Maguire, named Cathal, and the chieftain of the MacCaffreys.¹ Byngham's letter to the Lord Deputy describing the affair is a lengthy apology. He blames the darkness of the weather, and says the attack was not expected. He protests he could not handle the matter better, 'the forces of the garrison being laid at Sligo, and there remaining for the defence of those parts.'² In other words, Maguire's strategy held the main Connacht army around Ballymote while he himself attacked the Governor's post in County Roscommon.

On July 1–11, following this defeat, we learn that the Earl of Tyrone was employed to appease Maguire. Six days later a protection for two months was granted to the rebel chief.³ Meanwhile a report of the raids had reached the Queen through the Earl of Essex, and she at once issued a licence to Byngham to disregard the Deputy's instructions, and to invade O'Rourke's and Maguire's countries if he thought well of it.⁴ Maguire was not satisfied with the protection granted, and demanded that the time should be extended to six months, and that the protection should include his allies, Brian Og O'Ruaire and Conchubhar Og Mac Diarmada, and their followers. He refused to disperse his hired forces, and further claimed that Byngham should be restrained in his province.⁵ Tyrone was now commissioned to reason with Maguire, and in a

¹ Father Murphy mistranslates O Clery's reference to these casualties, page 63.

² *Cal. of State Papers*, 118–9.

³ *Ibid.* 120–3.

⁴ *Ibid.* 124, 122.

⁵ *Ibid.* 128.

short time he was able to report that the latter was willing to come in in company with himself. But the Deputy, seeing that Maguire was only trying to gain time, issued an ultimatum regarding the dispersal of his hired outside forces, and instructed Tyrone and Byngham to prepare to reduce him,¹ in case he refused the Deputy's order. On September 5-15 Tyrone definitely announced the failure of his mission. About a week later the musters were being got ready for service in the North, and Tyrone promised a force of 1,200 foot and 200 horse. Maguire's strength was estimated at 1,900 men.²

In September Sir Henry Bagenal³ received his commission to advance through Monaghan, in conjunction with Tyrone, against Maguire. He soon communicated with Byngham, ordering him to push up towards Fermanagh on the Connacht side.⁴ On receipt of this summons Byngham wrote from Boyle that his forces were small, that he had the Earl of Clanricard in his camp, and that he only awaited the Earl of Thomond before setting out. Bagenal waited in the neighbourhood of Enniskillen, but Byngham did not turn up in time, and eventually, on October 7-17,⁵ the Marshal had to push on towards Beleek, 'finding no means to pass the Erne where the enemy was.' He got into touch with Maguire on October 10-20, at the ford of Golune, near his objective. A sharp engagement followed. It is put by O Clery at October 6,⁶ an error due to some such mistake as reading .xx. 'twenty' as .vi. 'six,' and is described by Bagenal in his journal of the expedition :—

10. The day of service. The 10th we marched to the ford of Golun, beyond Beleek, where we found the enemy in his full strength, possessed of the passage fortified in the best manner they could. . . . The enemy upon our first approach bestowed their volleys, which did no great hurt ;

¹ *Cal. of State Papers*, 137-9.

² *Ibid.* 147, 146.

³ Murphy, *Life of Aodh Ruadh*, p. 65, wrongly translates 'Sir Henry Bingham.'

⁴ *Cal. of State Papers*, 160, 176.

⁵ *Ibid.* 178.

⁶ *Life of Aodh Ruadh*, § 31.

but after we were passed more than half the ford, they abandoned the place together in troops orderly; but perceiving us to be come over, both horse and foot, and our horsemen which first took land to make upon them with all speed, they fled and scattered, and we had the chase and killing of them with our horsemen above five miles. . . . The arch-traitor himself with his horsemen escaped narrowly into the wood. The same night, after the overthrow, we encamped in a bare place near Beleck on Connaught side.

Following on this disastrous engagement, Bagenal garrisoned Lisnaskeagh, the residence of Connor Roe Maguire.¹ About this time this Connor is described as the 'most dutifullest' man of that nation. But notwithstanding the victory at Golune, the occupation of Lisnaskeagh, and an offer of Sean an Bharra to serve against Maguire, the latter remained in possession of his castle of Enniskillen.² Byng-ham, too, fell back to his province, having on the day of the action lain '12 miles distant . . . supposing Maguire would have entered so far into the country, and there to have encountered him.'³ All this is indication that, in spite of the recent reverse, Maguire was still able to hold his ground.

The winter months of 1593-4 were, as O Clery says,⁴ unmarked by any hostilities. By the services of a traitor, Captain John Dowdall, the governor of Lisnaskeagh, secured Enniskillen Castle early in February.⁵ O Clery represents the Lord Deputy as carrying out the assault in person, but contemporary evidence shows that Fitzwilliam was in Dublin at the time.⁶ Another Irish authority who is at fault in regard to this operation is O Sullevan, who says⁷ that Sir Richard Byng-ham was in charge. This is not true, though the Governor of Connacht detached Captain

¹ *Cal. of State Papers*, 180.

² Bagenal's Journal, Oct. 21-31 (*Cal. of State Papers*, 180).

³ *Cal. of State Papers*, 169.

⁴ *Life of Aodh Ruadh*, § 32.

⁵ *Cal. of State Papers*, 207-8.

⁶ *Life of Aodh Ruadh*, § 33; *Cal. of State Papers*, 202-3. O Clery's statement has been incorporated in all the popular histories, including the latest, Hayden and Moonan, *Short Hist. of the Irish People*, 249.

⁷ *Hist. Cath.*, tom 3, bk. 2, ch. 7.

George Byngnam to co-operate with Dowdall, which he did under the guidance of an O Rourke.¹

The new garrison was placed under the command of James Eckarsall. The castle was re-attacked by Maguire on May 17-27;² by June 8-18 it was actually under siege. This siege it was that led to the defeat of Sir Henry Duke, when coming up with a relieving force. O Donnell and Cormac macBaron O Neill now joined Maguire, most probably with the connivance of the Earl of Tyrone. About the same period O Donnell employed a large force of Scots mercenaries, which landed under Domhnall Gorm Mac Domhnaill and Mac Leoid of Harris at Inishowen early in August.³ There is a big discrepancy between the accounts of the action which soon took place at the spot on the Arney river where now stands Drumaine bridge. A despatch of date August 5-15 implies that the English relief force was not more than 700 men. O Sullivan, whose account is very full, says Duke had 2,500 at his command. The battle was fought on August 7-17. The same authority states that the English lost over 400 men, and immense supplies of stores and equipment. The place had its name changed thereafter from Beal Atha Farnna to Beal Atha na mBrisgi.⁴

In reference to what happened at Enniskillen immediately after this battle, the two main authorities on the Irish side are at fault, as well as contradictory of each other. O Sullivan ends his narrative of the engagement thus: 'Exercitus regii fusi et fugati divulgato nuncio, Iniskellinna arx ab Odonello circumsessa in deditionem venit, propugnatoribus ex pacto dimissis, et Macguier est in integrum restitutus.' This means that, according to this authority, O Donnell captured the castle of Enniskillen soon after the battle of the Arney. On the other hand, O Clery indicates

¹ *Cal. of State Papers*, 203, 208.

² *Ibid.* 251.

³ *Life of Aodh Ruadh*, § 35; *Cal. of State Papers*, 259.

⁴ *Hist. Cath.*, tom. 3, bk. 2, ch. 11. O Clery gives the more proper form Ath na mBriosgadh, § 37.

that it was Maguire¹ himself who accepted its surrender. The fact is that neither got possession of Enniskillen at this time. The new Lord Deputy, Sir William Russell, advanced with a strong force by way of Athlone and Boyle into Fermanagh, relieved the ward of the castle on August 30–September 9, and re-garrisoned and re-victualled the place a day or so later. Russell's journal states that 'my lord marched towards the castle, and entered it without any let.'² In other words, Maguire raised the siege, as indeed his letter of August 26 to the Lord Deputy and Council, making 'supplication for pardon,' implies.

The contemporary papers prove that this was the actual course of events. Bagwell,³ who had studied the originals, is the only historian who gives a correct account of the proceedings of 1594. Other writers usually follow the version of O Clery, or the Four Masters, who copy O Clery. These authorities frequently exaggerate the exploits of O Donnell, and their method is well exemplified in the present case. O Clery says⁴:—

O Donnell and his Scots turned back, and he remained in his own territory until he again got a message from Maguire to inform him that the Deputy, Sir Wm. Russell, was threatening to come to Enniskillen to re-take it. When O Donnell heard that, he collected his hosting, native and mercenary, and went to Fermanagh. He remained then in Tirkennedy, to the east of Loch Erne. The army made huts and tents there, and they stayed so from the end of August to October 5. As the Deputy heard that O Donnell was waiting for him, and Maguire also, and both their forces, and as he knew that O'Neill would come to their aid, he became afraid of them, and he did not leave Dublin then. When O Donnell was certain that the Deputy would not come to Enniskillen on that occasion, he returned to his own country.

¹ 'When the warders of the castle of Enniskillen heard of the defeat of the army which intended to come to their aid, they gave up all hope of relief, and surrendered the castle to Maguire' (*Life of Aodh Ruadh*, § 37).

² *Cal. of Carew Papers*, 222; *Cal. of State Papers*, 262, 263, 268. 'The Lord Deputy shortly after tooke the field, and . . . drew the forces into Fermanagh that he might releve Enis-Kellin, and expell mac Guire out of his countrey' (Fynes Moryson, under 1594).

³ *Ireland under the Tudors*, iii. 244.

⁴ *Life of Aodh Ruadh*, § 38. This passage is not incorporated by the Four Masters

This paragraph refers to the period subsequent to Maguire's alleged capture of Enniskillen, which capture, in turn, is supposed to have followed the victory on the Arney, on August 7-17. Now, a reference to two pages of the printed *Calendar of State Papers*, 271-272, will show that, not only did the chiefs Maguire and O Donnell not terrify the Deputy, and so prevent him from approaching Fermanagh, but that they were actually in correspondence with him while he lay in Enniskillen and its neighbourhood. On August 25, O Donnell writes from Derry to the Lord Deputy and Council, and 'offers a dutiful subjection if he may have peace for all those that are banished to his country.' Their reply is dated September 1, from the 'Castle of Inniskillin.' A further letter of O Donnell is addressed to the Lord Deputy alone, and dated August 30-September 9, from Lifford. The Tirconnell chief was obviously not awaiting the enemy in Tirkennedy then. Maguire sued for pardon on August 26, and the Deputy and Council answered him on September 3, from the 'camp near Slugh Begh.' Slieve Beagh lies on the Fermanagh-Monaghan border. Manifestly, therefore, this paragraph of O Clery's is only a flourish.

The Earl of Tyrone had appeared in Dublin on the arrival of the new Deputy, and had contrived to get back to the North, notwithstanding Sir Henry Bagenal's charges against him and Russell's will to apprehend him. Nothing could entice him to Dublin afterwards, and during the winter of 1594-5 he was, in fact, in rebellion, though he was not actually then proclaimed a traitor. On December 5-15 the Lord Deputy and Council announced to the Privy Council in England that 'Tirone has drawn to his party all the chief lords of countries; her Majesty's best urraghs have been driven to abandon their countries; in the whole province of Ulster no part standeth for her Majesty except Knockfergus, the Newry, Monaghan, Enniskillen, and the Blackwater.'¹ Thenceforward the leading part in the

¹ *Cal. of State Papers*, 284.

rebellion was taken by O Neill, but Maguire remained one of Tyrone's chief lieutenants till his death in 1600.

On January 6-16, 1595, it was reported that Maguire had taken the bawn of Enniskillen, and slain seven of the garrison, but as late as March 12-22, Monaghan and Enniskillen, though both hardly pressed, were still in English hands.¹ In May, O Donnell, Maguire and Cormac mac Baron assaulted the castle in Longford, took the constable and his wife prisoners, and carried off a prey of 10,000 cattle. Towards the end of the same month Enniskillen was recovered.² The Blackwater fort, called by the Irish Port Mor, had been captured by Art macBaron, as early as February 16-26, and in the same month extensive burnings were carried out on behalf of the Irish in Farney and in Cavan.³ Lastly, in connexion with the relief of Monaghan, O Neill first encountered an English force in the field, and inflicted on Sir Henry Bagenal a sharp defeat at Clontibret.

In connexion with this last engagement, it is to be noted that an unfortunate series of errors in O Sullivan has misled all the modern writers of Irish histories, from John Mitchel down, in their accounts of this battle. O Sullivan says Sir John Norris was the English commander on the occasion, and the Four Masters represent that general as having come to Ireland 'in the end of the month of February.'⁴ Norris did not reach Dublin from England until May 30, and his business to the North did not bring him to Dundalk earlier than June 19.⁵ Now, the expedition by Bagenal to the relief of Monaghan, and his defeat at Clontibret, were nearly a month past at the latter date. Bagenal's despatch on the affair is dated May 29,⁶ and Sir John Norris himself, in a letter of June 4

¹ *Cal. of State Papers*, 291, 303; *Life of Aodh Ruadh*, § 48.

² *Ibid.* 315, 317.

³ *Ibid.* 298-9. 'Ad hoc flumen erat castellum, huius belli casibus clarum, eodem nomine Anglis nuncupatum Aqua Nigra, sed Ibernis Portmor' (O Sullivan, tom. 3, bk. 2, ch. 13).

⁴ *Hist. Cath.*, tom. 3, bk. 3, ch. 2.

⁵ *Cal. of State Papers*, 322, 337.

⁶ *Ibid.* 319.

from Dublin,¹ says that Bagenal was in charge of 1,500 foot and 300 horse for the undertaking. The event is chronicled by the Four Masters at page 1986 of volume vi, though they make the minor error of stating that Sir John Norris 'ordered' the expedition. They do not mention the place where the battle took place. The point of the narrative was altogether missed by O Donovan, and in consequence, commenting on an account (vi. 1970) of an event which occurred later in the same year, he quotes O Sullivan's remarks on what happened at Clontibret in May. It is interesting to note that a lieutenant who was present at this fight estimated O Neill's strength at 14,000 or 15,000 men a week afterwards,² whereas Sir John Norris, on August 2, makes the common-sense remark, 'we have discovered that the rebel's forces is nothing so great as those victuallers of Monaghan did make them.'

From a paper of July 20-30 one might gather that 'the Earl, O Donnell, Maguire and all their forces' were not far from Newry about that date, but a letter written by Maguire from Enniskillen on the same day would seem to indicate that he was then thinking of negotiating a peace. This latter document is thus summarized³:—

Maguire to one that hath been employed to him. Accepts thankfully his message. Cannot agree that both pardon and patent should be detained from him till he may do service upon the chief of the North. Wishes that those who have too much power over him might receive some foil. He is not able to bear a sheriff or officers for a time. He will do nothing hurtful until he receives an answer.

In the month of August O Donnell made a successful raid into Connacht, and penetrated into that province as far as Tuam.⁴ A little later Maguire was in O Donnell's company when a detachment of the latter's force slew Captain Christopher Martin, a nephew of Sir Richard Byngham.⁵

In the course of this year, efforts were made to seduce

¹ *Cal. of State Papers*, 324.

² *Cal. of Carew Papers*, 110.

³ *Cal. of State Papers*, 365.

⁴ *Life of Aodh Ruadh*, § 56.

⁵ *Ibid.* § 57.

Maguire from his allegiance to O'Neill. On July 14-24 the Lord Deputy informed ¹ Cecil that 'Maguire had made offer to come in, promising some acceptable service for his life.' A later letter of the chief has been already quoted. The Deputy comments on the 'darkness of Maguire's offer' on August 16-26, and finally we hear that 'Maguire's offers are short of that which some other undertook for him,' September 8-18. By this latter date the prolonged series of negotiations with O'Neill and the northern chieftains had begun.

PAUL WALSH.

¹ *Cal. of State Papers*, 341.

A CLERICAL ECONOMIST

BY REV. E. J. QUIGLEY

‘WHO drives fat cattle should himself be fat,’ said Dr. Johnson with grave folly; and a man who writes on economics should have experience and practice in the economy which he preaches. Irishmen generally lack the economic sense; and clergy, for certain reasons, practise little economy. Perhaps they fear the Scylla of avarice or the equally hard rock, the Charybdis of prodigality. To be sure, young clergy are tempted to imitate Thackeray’s heroine, and to practise the methods which he explains in his chapter, ‘How to live on nothing a year.’ The temptation is always banished and conquered by grace, by the remembrance of the seventh commandment, and by the thought of certain synodal decrees. The life and works of an almost forgotten hero, who practised and wrote on personal and national economy, may therefore interest, encourage and teach those who are on the clerical poverty line. He was an expert in both personal and national economics—a doctor *utriusque juris*, though he had no degree—a man who, in his poverty, went about doing good. His life shows how much good can be done by a prudent cleric with a slender stipend, when he has the head and heart to plan and the hand and voice to dare. And his life shows us the state of Ireland in the days of Swift (1667-1745), of Steele (1671-1729), and of Goldsmith (1728-1774).

Perhaps a paragraph recalling to the reader’s mind the state of the laws in Ireland in the early eighteenth century may tend to make things mentioned in the course of this paper plainer. In 1703 Ormond passed a bill ‘for discouraging the further growth of Popery.’ The Irish landholders were told that they could get back their rights, by

conforming to the Protestant religion; they had none to blame but themselves. The Penal Laws provided, first, that the child of Catholic parents who wished to become a Protestant could apply to the Court of Chancery for maintenance out of their estate. If he was the eldest son, he became owner of the property, his father being only tenant for life. Any priest who became a Protestant received £20 or £40 per annum. No one could teach school publicly or privately unless he took an oath abjuring the Catholic faith. An attempt at teaching without having taken such an oath was punished by a £10 fine on the teacher or his employers. Anyone 'discovering' any bishop, dean, Jesuit, or monk, not registered, or any schoolmaster, should receive £20 for each priest, and £10 for each schoolmaster, to be levied off the Catholics of the county. Any two justices of the peace could summon any Catholic of the age of sixteen or upwards to say when and where he was last present at Mass, what other persons were present, and where the priest resided; and if he refused to answer, he was imprisoned for a year and fined £20. The justices were active and zealous; and the law of 1709 gave rise to the 'priest-hunters,' whom the Commons told that 'informing against Papists was an honourable service to the Government.'

Derriaghy was the native place of our hero, Philip Skelton (1706-1787). He was born and lived while the Penal Laws were in full vigour. But not even the pupils of Irish Intermediate schools, not even the boys and girls who, to the sweet question, 'Explain clearly why fair Margaret was pale?' (Junior Grade, 1912) answered so marvelously, can say where Derriaghy is! It is a quiet spot near Lisburn. There Skelton's grandfather and father lived. His grandfather had been sent from England to inspect forts for King James. He was a gunsmith, and taught his son the trade. When the Williamite wars broke out, Richard Skelton was hauled off to mend Jacobite guns, and later to mend Williamite ones. War's alarms drove the Skeltons to Island Magee, near Carrickfergus;

the kindness of the Catholics there was only equalled by the splendid fidelity of their Catholic neighbours at Derriaghy, who guarded their lands and houses at great risk. On the re-union of father and family their joy and gratitude were so great and so lasting that Richard Skelton taught his sons to love and esteem their down-trodden neighbours, the Catholics. He was a man of ability, of great industry, and, above all, a lover of the poor. His lessons were not forgotten by one member of the family, Philip. By unwearied industry and frugality, Richard Skelton gave his sons a classical education and succeeded in getting them into Trinity as sizars. Philip went to Trinity and cut no great figure in the schools. He had, perforce, to be frugal. But he enjoyed his terms. He was a man of great stature, commanding gait, and very handsome. All Dublin knew the big sizar, who was the best wrestler and fencer at Donnybrook Fair. Indeed, he won a prize at that historic gathering for cudgel playing ! But his university course was shortened by the Provost, who, listening to a false report, that poor Skelton was a Jacobite, gave him no peace, withdrew his sizarship, and barely gave him time to take his degree. The refuge of so many poor Irishmen, teaching, was all that was open to him. He became an usher, but not for long. He determined to enter the Church, and went to Enniskillen for ordination. He had always, as a boy and as a man, a deeply religious mind, and the step was taken with deliberation and prayer. The candidates slept in the Bishop's palace and were noisy and boisterous. One was very annoying, so the man from Derriaghy threw him down stairs. The ordaining prelate, Dr. Sterne, who vacated St. Patrick's, Dublin, to Dean Swift, gave the newly-ordained a little discourse. 'Gentlemen, I had some notion of making each of you write a little piece of composition, as is usual on such occasions ; but I have thought better of it now, and in place of it, I'll ask you to a little piece of advice—I'll give it after dinner—relating to your behaviour as clergymen, which will be more useful to you and more pleasing to me than any nonsense you could write.'

Now, an ex-dean of St. Patrick's, who had gravitated into a splendid salaried sinecure in Clogher, must have been especially eloquent after dinner. And Burdy, the biographer of Skelton, heard Skelton oft repeat Sterne's advice to the newly-ordained. It differs greatly from what my readers received, but may be useful, in the future, to those who wish to vary the monotony of the young, and to lift the weight of awe which in certain places and with certain persons long abides. It may be useful, too, to college dons.

You may think [said he] that good preaching will make you agreeable to your people ; but here, I must tell you, you are quite mistaken. It is not for this they'll like you ; but I'll teach you a method of gaining all their favour. Look out for some humorous jest-book and pick out all the droll stories you meet with in it and get them by heart. Then, if you are able, make up some ones of your own, with all the circumstances of time and place ; indeed, if I had time, I could tell you a few of my own making, which might serve you on occasions. Take care also to recollect every witty thing you hear in company and fix it in your memory. Thus equipped you will be well qualified for the duties of your parish. For, when you go to christenings, marriages, or wakes, you may easily entertain everyone by your witty jokes, so that your company will be sought for over the whole parish.

Sterne did not impress Skelton, but Skelton went once to see Sterne and was sorely tempted to impress him with an article he loved and used at Donnybrook Fair. For Sterne could not steal the poor curate's purse, but he attempted by a mean lie to steal his good name. Sterne was pilloried by Swift (*vide* Swift's Letters, July, 1733), and Swift was a master of criticism.

Skelton's first professional work was as curate in Manor-watthouse, Co. Fermanagh, where he lived in the rector's house and taught his children. The rector, Rev. Dr. Madden, 'Premium' Madden, of Trinity College, and founder of the Royal Dublin Society, had, through domestic unhappiness, fled to Dublin and joined up as a militia officer. Skelton did curate and usher for three years—bitter, weary years ; for the revered matron who ruled in the rectory and her children made his life a hell. He had lived on £40 a year with board and residence and had paid pressing debts and urgent claims. But nothing could induce him to endure

the rector's wife. To Monaghan town he went as curate ; and there, for eighteen years, he lived and paid his lodging and board on £40 a year. In addition, he paid £10 a year to his poor mother, he paid £30 to his sister's dowry, he paid the school fees of young Knox (who in time became Under Secretary for Ireland), for young Leslie, son of a deceased friend. He bought a respectable library, gave free of cost to the poor his skill and drugs, dressed well, visited the neighbouring squires and helped poor curates. Does he merit the name of economist ? His biographer tells many witty stories of his long residence as curate. He tells us of the zeal in systematic visitation of his flock, his long hours teaching catechism, and his earnest and eloquent sermons. For Skelton was a man of great activity and industry. He did not show his flock the rough and thorny road to heaven while he himself took the primrose path of dalliance. His work and words were famous in several northern towns, where, in his fine clarion tones, he gave special sermons. It was destined to charm London congregations. He was known well locally. No one who saw his fine face and figure ever forgot him. He walked often to Lisburn to see his mother and his old home. Stories are told of his long trappings, cudgel in hand, of his whacking a cursing tinker, a blasphemous officer, and a rude churchwarden. He was beloved by all, especially by the young clergy, who admired his wisdom, manliness, and odd ways. All the senior clergy said he was mad. But senior clergy said the same about Columbus, about Francis Xavier, about Owen Roe O'Neill, and about many others. Sterne hated him, and when vacancies in parishes occurred, men might come and men might go but Skelton remained curate. Several times Monaghan parish and other parishes became vacant, but there was no promotion for him ; he celebrated often his passover.

In 1736 he wrote a very fine pamphlet, imitating Swift's sarcasm and irony. It was against an English Bishop. It drew praise from Swift and complimentary guineas from Sterne. In Monaghan he wrote the book which brought

him fame and fortune, *Deism Revealed*. To place his book, he journeyed to London in 1748, and there he met Dr. Johnson, Goldsmith, and many other leading thinkers and writers. He was invited to preach, and his first sermon was so beautiful that he received requests from a number of parsons to preach and to lecture in their spacious churches. The book was an immense success, ran through several editions, and brought the poor author fame and money. It occupies a great part in the six octavo volumes which contain the poor parson's works. It is dreary stuff, arguments in dialogue, badly put, badly maintained, badly arranged. Yet, it was on this Skelton made his name. Any part of his work—hymns, Latin poetry, essays—is far superior to this pious book.

He returned to his poor lodgings in Monaghan and plodded about the usual round of clerical duty, until Dr. Delany, Swift's friend, wrote to Bishop Clayton that if Skelton were not promoted to a decent living, that one must be found for him outside Clogher diocese. Clayton was irritated by the interference of the college don, but took the hint and promoted Skelton, to what Burdy calls the most remote, wildest, and most impoverished part of Clogher diocese—Pettigo. It is a small village on the Donegal border. It was Skelton's reward for twenty-one year's work at £40 a year. He had seen, as he stated, absentees, permanent invalids, sots, illiterate boys, promoted, promoted, and promoted, but that dreary place was all that Clayton would give him. By the sale of his work in London he had a few pounds, he bought a horse, and set off on the wretched roads in mid-winter for his new home.

The roads were bad and few, the lodgings were bad and few, robbers were bad and many. On arrival in Donegal he found no official residence, could not find a suitable house to rent, and he had to be content with one miserable room in a thatched cottage, his bed screened off from his visitors' view. Here few visited him. His flock were absolute pagans, sunk in vice, living in concubinage, drunkards, ignorant of all things holy. He visited them in their houses,

invited them to church, taught them catechism, prayed and preached—soon to empty benches. Asking his adults how many Gods are there, some said two, some said three. His efforts were useless. The scores of private stills in the islets of Lough Erne had ruined his flock of Plantation people. His soul turned from his boors, and going amongst the poor Catholics, he won their undying love and gratitude. From house to house he went, seeing their misery, poverty, hunger. His medical knowledge was as useful and as grateful as his kind advice and encouragement. Here he met the heroic virtue, the joys, the sorrows, the wants and ways, and, above all, the manly spirit of the Donegal peasant. They loved him, and he loved them.

In 1787 a great famine gripped Ireland; it was especially severe in Ulster. The peasants around Pettigo had no food, no money, no friend to guide, no physician. Hunger and disease were visiting every cabin. Skelton, the kind parson, tramped up the mountains to gauge the extent of the distress in the cabins. He found the poor eating boiled weeds. He found a poor woman lying in childbed, her only food blood and sorrel. 'The blood, her husband, who was a herdsman, took from the cattle of others under his care, for he had none of his own. This was a usual sort of food in that country, in times of scarcity, for they bled the cows for that purpose, and thus the same cow often afforded both milk and blood.'¹ Skelton sent this poor creature a hundred of meal, a pound of sugar, and a bottle of brandy. He bought huge quantities of oatmeal, which he gave gratis to the poor on Mondays. On Fridays he rode far into the country to meet his carters, bringing the corn from Dundalk and Drogheda, to guard them and their loads from famished thieves. But the Donegal peasant loathed a dole, and grieved to see the parson sell his horse, grieved to know that his appeals were unheeded by the landlords, tithe proctors, and squires. They could never become professional cadgers and beggars;

¹ Skelton's Life by Burdy.

They were what the Italians call *poveri vergognosi*—the shame-faced poor. So Skelton quickly and cleverly got from Drogheda flax, which he gave to the spinners, who sold their wares to him. He paid an abnormal price, as his wish was to feed the hungry, not to make profit. The very poor, the old, the feeble, he fed free, and for months he bought flax and gave meal. The demand was great. His purse was empty, his friends were tired of his complaints; and at last he made the sacrifice, the greatest sacrifice after life itself, he sold his dearest and most beloved possession—his books. Book-loving clerics in lonely presbyteries can realize the pangs of the poor lonely scholar selling his books, the books bought in his humble poverty of sizarship in Dublin, the books bought in his servitude as tutor, in his £40 a year life in Monaghan. Readers of Swift know the names and the themes and the prices of a parson's library of the time. He got £80 for his treasure, and two ladies, hearing of his heroic sacrifice, sent him £50 for his starving poor.

In the hovels of the poor he learned their wants and ways, and earned their undying love and trust. His medical knowledge he freely used, but he noticed his remedies, his lotions and potions, left something wanting, something was missing from the happiness of recovery, something retarding the regaining of strength, something essential to their comfort in life and death. They told him, the parson living under the penal laws, paid by the Government which said informing against Papists was an honourable service—they wanted a priest. How they trusted poor Skelton. He procured a priest, but the priest could not live permanently amongst them. Skelton saw that without a priest all and everything was wanting to his beloved of the Donegal mountain. Bishop Daniel O'Reilly visited, in secret, the wretched village. Skelton, the parson, dined the Popish Bishop and pleaded for a suspended priest! The Bishop granted the request, and Skelton supported the priest until he himself left Donegal. These things happened in the dark and evil days of the penal times. No parson of our

time could be manly enough to do such things for Popery ; and, perhaps, no Bishop would hearken to such pleadings of a parson. And, as for accepting a parson's invitation to dine in a thatched hovel, with its clay floor, no Bishop, outside *partes infidelium*, could dream of such a thing.

Ten years in the wilds of Donegal had changed Skelton's whole view of life. Always deeply religious, the lives of the peasants had taught him many lessons. He was in poverty and in rags. 'He used in cold weather to go through Pettigo with a straw rope about him to keep his large coat on, being never fond of finery ; nor, indeed, was it requisite in that very remote part of our island,' says Burdy. Men talked of his merits, his virtue, his works, and wondered that he was not wearing a mitre. Talk is sporadic, and spores live so long, especially prelatie spores, that the present writer heard and saw them in the very spot where Skelton starved. But Skelton did not try spore culture. He looked at his rags, his brogues, his bare, cheerless room, with its clay floor, and laughed long and loud. He knew the Protestant prelates of whom Primate Stuart wrote about that time, 'Fix Mr. Beresford in Kilmore . . . and we shall have then three Bishops in one district, reported to be the most profligate in Europe.'

He was promoted to a big parish near Enniskillen, named Devenish, having a church at Monea and Trory, one on each shore of Lough Erne. It was unworkable according to Skelton's methods ; political fury disturbed him, and he was unhappy and bitter. To a gentleman in Enniskillen he gave a shilling. 'Here, take this ; I gave a shilling to see a camel in Dublin, but an honest man is a greater wonder in Fermanagh'—(Burdy). A local magnate often invited Skelton to visit him. Skelton replied, 'To be plain with you, sir, you are too great a man for me to be acquainted with.' And Rev. Samuel Burdy, the Boswell of Skelton, adds one of his countless comments to this reply of Skelton, 'By these and many other instances it appears that Mr. Skelton was void of hypocrisy, a quality which has often helped to insinuate ecclesiastics.' Rev. Samuel

must have been a bitter, disappointed man, for he ever tilts at those in high places. Hence, even the revised version of Burdy, from which I quote, is piquant, strong food, and unwholesome for youth. Unrevised Burdy, as he is in his first edition in Trinity College Library, is quite Juvenalistic.

The landlord, Lord Hartford, of his old homestead at Derriaghy asked Skelton in his Fermanagh parish what sort of living he held, and the parson said, 'A very good living, please your excellency ; much better than I deserve.' And Burdy adds, 'Few clergymen would return such an answer to a Lord Lieutenant ; for most of them think they have nothing equal to their merits.'

At length promotion came. An Englishman named Garnet became Bishop, and knowing Skelton's worth and his writings, gave him a good living, Fintona, Co. Tyrone. Of him the good Burdy remarks, 'This Bishop, though he had but one eye, could discover, I am told, men of merit, as well as some people with two eyes. . . . A superior who treats a man of learning and abilities with coldness and indifference shows he has no regard for literature.' Burdy probably never read the dictum of Lactantius, 'Litterati non habent fidem.' Skelton was profuse in his thanks ; he would then have a competency and a curate.

In Tyrone his flock was drunken, illiterate, boorish, non-church goers. So again he turned to the Celts, different and very different from his Donegal peasants. In Tyrone they were the hot, independent, industrious men of the stern land of Owen Roe, lacking all the charm and sweet simplicity of the Donegal mountaineers. He went amongst them as a doctor, and taking away much practice from the local medical man, Dr. Gormly, a Catholic, he allowed him £40 a year, and on his death reared his orphans. In Tyrone he was near his loved Derriaghy, where he visited every year in summer, and where he gave all the neighbours an open-air feast. Once on a visit here, Hamil, the old Catholic herd, who, as a young man, guarded the farm and flock for

the Skeltons in their flight to Island Magee, asked Skelton how was it that, loving the Catholics, he did not share their faith. But the parson was silent.

In Tyrone the terrible famine years 1757 and 1787 found Skelton. He began again to feed the poor, to distribute corn and meal and flax. He sold all, even his horse, his gold buttons. He gave back half the tithes. He took cheaper lodgings, went in rags, did everything to save his starving countrymen.

But the illness from which his father died gripped the good man. He resided for months every year in Dublin, always in poor lodgings, always helping every appeal. After four years going and coming to Tyrone from Dublin he resigned his parish, and after a long and severe illness died May, 1787. He was buried in St. Peter's churchyard, Dublin, and over his grave stood a marble stone with a long and laboured inscription. It told all and sundry that he was 81 years old, that 'Liberally endowed by Providence with intellectual Perfections, He did not suffer them to lie waste through Inactivity, Nor did he pervert them by Indiscretion. His understanding he habituated to attentive Reflection, Invigorating it by exercise, and enriching it with Information. . . ."

Skelton's works contain sermons, works on Deism, Theism, hymns, Latin poetry, papers on the Lough Derg Pilgrimage, on a well in Co. Monaghan which cured jaundice, and what is most interesting, 'The Necessity of Tillage.' Readers of Dr. George O'Brien's volumes on the economics of Ireland in the eighteenth century must be interested in details of economics of that age. And clergy who practice the ancient calling of the grand old gardener and his wife and children, Cain and Abel, can compare modern theory, practice, and price with those in vogue in days long past in our land.

The Derriaghy economist fully realized the superiority of Ulster men and methods to those used in Southern Ireland, although he never saw Munster! But, like modern

sages, he knew that mixed farming, tillage, and pasturage is Ireland's way to wealth and prosperity.

In the County of Louth and great part of Meath [he wrote] those grounds which were formerly stocked with sheep are now converted to tillage. This the inhabitants learned from their neighbours in the North. They know by this time, whether they have reason to repent or rejoice in what they have done. But this everyone knows, that they go on ploughing and producing such crops as hinder them from ever thinking of returning to pasturage. The counties of Dublin and Kildare are taking the useful hint from Louth and Meath. I hope it will go farther.

The economist takes a thirty-six acre farm as his standard and compares the profits of grazing and tillage.

Twenty-seven acres, Irish measure, will graze twenty-one cows and the remaining nine acres will furnish them with hay.

The twenty-one cows will produce twenty-one calves value	£12 12 0
And twenty-one hundred of butter, at £1 2s.	23 2 0
Buttermilk	19 16 0
Total	£55 10 0
The profits for five years	£277 10 0

Out of the same sum we must deduct for the maintenance of a family to manage the dairy £19 12s. 5d., which in five years comes to £98 2s. 1d. The remaining neat profits will be £179 7s. 11d.

The second kind of grazing, namely, of dry cows and bullocks :

Thirty-six cows bought at May and sold at All Saints for £1 per cow profit	£36 0 0
Out of which, if we deduct for buying, selling, and herding the sum of	1 12 6
The remainder will be	34 7 6
The clear profits will be for five years	171 17 6

O happy graziers, who for £1 12s. 6d. per year could cover the cost of buying, selling, and herding !

Expenses for five years in tillage of twelve acres :

For wheat, 3 ploughings and two harrowings at 15s. per acre	£9 0 0
For seed, 12 barrels at 15s. per barrel, for reaping £3	13 0 0
Third year—oats, ploughing and harrowing, £4 16s. ; seed, 27 barrels at 4s. 8d.=£6 6s. ; reaping £2 8s.	13 10 0
Fourth year	13 10 0
Fifth year—flax, ploughing and harrowing, £7 4s. ; flax seed, 12 barrels at £1 8s. per barrel	24 4 0
Total expenses	£75 4 0
Profits from crops	£279 12 0
Deduct expenses	75 4 0
Neat profit	£204 8 0

Readers will please note the studied accuracy of the economist ; he excels the Department of Agriculture in his figures, his shillings and pence !

Some rude persons objected, that to till means many hands and much deductions for their food and raiment It is of interest to know the maintenance of a farmer's family in the fearful years preceding 1798.

The maintenance of a farmer's family, consisting of six persons, four of whom are able to work, during one year. And first for their food :—

To 40 bushels of shelling, each bushel of which will yield 45 bushels of clean meal, and equal to five pounds in seeds for flummery, which altogether would bake into 60 lbs. of bread. This, at 3s. per bushel, amounts to	£6 0 0
52 bushels of potatoes	2 12 0
6 quarts of buttermilk, at 1d each day	1 10 5
1 cwt. of skim-milk cheese	0 8 5
1 cwt. of butter and 1 cwt. of salt	1 4 8
Ordinary carcase of beef	1 0 0
Firing and hearth money	1 10 0
Two roods of garden, digging, sowing, etc.	0 12 0
	<hr/>
	£14 17 5

Note here, that a good part of the above is yearly saved by pottage made of whey, of lenten pottage, sluik, unthrown sheep, fowl, and pigs.

Their clothing is as follows :

17 yards of country cloth or frize, at 1s. per yard, making two suits for men, with making and trimming	£1 10 0
8 pairs of brogues and four pairs of stockings for two men for the year	0 13 0
13 yards of linen at 8d. per yard for four shirts for two men and two hats	0 12 0
As an ordinary gown and petticoat is cheaper than a man's suit and lasts much longer, and as farmers' wives seldom wear any shoes or stockings at home, and as the clothes of the children are usually made up from old things, we will allow for the clothing of the women and children the same as for the men	2 15 0

Total for food and clothing	£20 7 5
-----------------------------	---------

Thus he proved his thesis that mixed tillage is best ; that hands cost little.

Surely, in his domestic life and in his writings he

deserves the title of an economist. His figures are sad, sad reading, of human beings in slavery, rags, and hunger. Where he ministered in Donegal and Tyrone the peasants still tell stories of his great kindness, his strength of body, his odd ways. But at Derriaghy his name and fame are almost forgotten and unknown. To queries made some years ago, a jaundice-faced man replied, 'I did hear of such a man. He was mad, and gave all his money to rogues and rascals. I heert that he died a Papist.'

O ! rare Phil Skelton.

E. J. QUIGLEY.

THE RULING TRAIT OF BENSON'S CHARACTER

BY REV. JAMES F. CASSIDY

THE character of Benson furnishes vast material for the construction of an illusory critique. It is one wherein judgment might make fatal errors by the failure to realize the presence of a problem, the solution of which reveals the pivotal point round which the whole man revolved. His life was so expressive, his soul was so forcibly projected into the outer world, that there is a danger of grasping at mere accidentals, exalting them to the position of essentials, and distorting the latter's nature by viewing them in a false perspective. The external manifestations of his character—and they were fanciful and varied—can be properly understood only by boring through the outward man until the realities from which they spring are reached. There the discerning eye must see a unifying, commanding quality of soul, where the true man can be intued and all varieties reconciled.

To hear the man give expression to his thoughts by word of mouth, or look upon his soul through the crystal-line medium of his *Confessions*, should lead to the discovery of his salient passion. In his fiery verbal rush and onslaught of thought he ever assaulted the ramparts of ignorance and penetrated the crust of the superficial. The truth, the reality, he searched for with the zest of an old-time seeker of the Holy Grail. He sought the true for, like Daniel Webster, he realized that 'there is nothing so powerful as truth.' Benson's spirit clamoured for strength—the orthodox power wherewith he might launch his energies most efficiently upon the world around him. Other natural tendencies might run counter to his chief endeavour

but once he realized their trend they had to stand aside for truth's triumphal progress. He was a realist of the most stern type, demanding to see things as they are, instead of the hypocrisy of appearances. He wanted to see what he saw. Naturally of a very sensitive temperament, he cast his feelings to the winds and rode on the winds of grim resolve when the vision of great realities claimed him. The world might think as it willed, Benson thought and said, with supreme nonchalance, 'dicunt, quid dicunt? dicant.' For, with Dr. Johnson, he believed that, of the veracity of speech, 'martyrdom is the test.'

No matter where he operated, he sought to go to the heart of things, the seat of truth and vitality. In the highest movements of the soul, where spirit grasps at spirit, he hungered after realism. Of one stage of his religious development, he wrote: 'The spiritual world is going to come up like a thunderstorm, appallingly real.' In his reading he rushed through the written page at an excessive rate, yet never so rapidly as to prevent him tearing the heart out of a book. Though the artistic and the romantic in him loved the poetry of ritual and symbolism they could not drink in satisfaction from a ceremonial performance stamped with hollowness and divorced from truth. In his Eton days he sounded the shallowness of its spiritual code, and never warmed to a religion that lived in mere externalism. From certain lectures of Father Maturin he discovered how beneath the sacramental order the great ultimates of existence—'body and spirit—were alike met in the mercy of God.' Newman's *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, which was so potent in leading him to faith, so captivated his reason because it presented to him a growth presupposing life and hostile to sterility. He came face to face with a living spirit and felt satisfied. From the sparse data of a little Coptic church in Egypt he extracted the first great principles of Catholicism that placed him on the highway to Rome. Seeking the stable, immovable, and certain, he was restless amid the insecure written formularies of Anglicanism. He became

uneasy in the shifting sands where no repository of infallible authority abided, where no vitalism supported words, and never rested until he found safety and truth in the Church of Rome. Later on, even when the fullness of light dawned upon him and he sighted the City on the Hill, with scrutinizing gaze he 'eyed it, watching for the least wavering, if it were a mirage,' until he realized 'the truth as aloof as an ice-peak.' He had reached the primal goal of his existence after many devious wanderings. In it he found the fullness of content, for though never hermetically sealed to the good things of life he saw them robed in shallowness. In this sense how truly did he write: 'I did not want broad ways of pleasantness, but the narrow way that is Truth and Life.'

Out of the bed-rock of realism sprang the mystic and idealist. The thirst for the reality led him far in exploration into the realm of the spirit. He sought to probe the realism of ideas. The recognition of the fact that a certain amount of agnosticism, consequent on the creature's limitations, was inherent in every creed, acted as a stimulant to his curiosity and urged him to a continuity of effort hostile to the unknown and favourable to truth's campaign. For to him to find the truth was 'mysticism and the darkness of spiritual experience.' The profound problem of the action of spirit on body, reaching its acme of mystery in the Incarnation, he loved to ponder over and expound. So, too, was generated his intense interest in the problems of Spiritualism. All lawful occasions that he could find he accepted, in order to grapple with the intangible realities of the things that lie beyond the ken of sense. He slept on suicides' beds, though he was naturally fearful of supernatural presences. He revelled in the ghostly atmosphere of Versailles, 'crammed with apparitions.' At other times his everlasting quest led him far along the paths of exploration into the deep recesses of his mental being, as happened on the occasion of the retreat preceding his Anglican ordination. At that time the great output of energy incidental to the chase stranded him in a

state which, to use his own words, was 'spiritually hysterical.' It was this ever-present goad that made quietism, though it might seem a paradox, a regular aspect of his life's progress. He found in it a shelter where soul, with least distress and hindrance, might react on soul, and satiate his primal craving. When, before conversion, he had not found the compass of authority to guide him to the truth, he sought refuge in the ways of 'spiritual intuition.' Then on he went upon his mystic crusade 'through all the tumbled country,' until he came to the look-out point of the Church, where the world was 'visible as it really is.' Here realism and mysticism nobly blended and functioned in harmony, for he found Catholicism 'reverent towards subjective faith as well as faithful to objective truth.'

As already stated, the pivotal factor moulding his life's tenor and activities was the magnetism of the true. Yet round this dominant force, growing from it, thriving on it, and coloured by it, were two marked characteristics often otherwise accounted for. In his progress through the heart of things he utilized an artistic temperament and was a firm believer in untiring labour. And as all owed their forceful nature to realism they were ever its subordinates and subjects.

Art was his constant companion in the quest for truth, because of its close affinity to that central object of his desires. Besides the alliance of truth and art was still more firmly secured by the common bond of the beautiful that rivetted them together. That the true must of its very nature radiate beauty he was convinced. That the revelation of beauty was part of the very essence of art he felt equally assured. Truth and beauty were co-terminous in art and mutually supporting. Therein he saw its highest value, its loftiest achievement. In religion he looked for truth's purest and most exalted revelations, and 'art,' he tells us, 'is religion in solution.' Ceremony appealed to him, not in its isolation, but mated to symbolism. Riot of pleasantly intermingling colours, orderly movements and

harmonious strains, in their mere external influence upon sense, he valued not. For him, the measure of their worth was their potency to speak of the reality that lay behind them and reveal upon their features the soul of things. In his Catholic life he treasured pleasant memories of the Church of England, because of her 'romantic mind,' the 'pleasant aroma' that hung about her, her music, and her language, yet only in so far as they tended to switch him on to the orthodox track that led homeward. For only too well did he realize that 'a soul cannot be eternally satisfied with kindness and a soothing murmur, and the singing of hymns.' This was his conviction, for Benson was first a man and secondly an artist. His essential manliness was concentrated in his realism, and to the latter art was subsidiary. 'D'abord je suis femme, et puis je suis artiste,' replied Pauline Viardot, when asked to solve the riddle of her great success. So it was with Benson: the artistic in him was rooted in truth, and attained to its success because of this affinity.

Of the vividness of these perceptions and the strength of these strivings was born a wondrously active life. To actuate his great ideal he never spared himself mentally or physically. He was fully cognizant of the type to which his individuality belonged and essayed to develop it accordingly. But in development there was little or no egoism. He sought no advertisement of self, and simply wished to 'let his light shine.' He wished to give the best of what was in him to the world, to leave the clearest impress of his allotted time on earth upon the face of human existence. Thus his energies were directed along two main channels, one assimilative, the other expressive. He knew that his output would be largely conditioned by his ability in storing his mind with knowledge. Fired by this conviction, the flood of energy which he expended in the endeavour to find raw material for the factory of his soul was enormous, and just as extensive were the manufactured proceeds. He often rushed through a host of books to find material for self-expression in a single volume; yet he

managed to tear from them substance for the soul, sinew and bone of his handiwork. United to this was a marked ability for mastering a vast volume of detail, wherewith he gave the artist's finish to his work. Speed did not warp his powers; he was a keen observer and had so developed the eclectic faculty within him that the high heat resulting from the rapid rotation of the wheels of mind only brightened its search-light effects.

The resultant was an intellect never suffering from dearth of ideas. Everywhere books and men and things, with terrific driving power, kept adding to his incubus of thought. To illustrate this point suffice it to cite one instance. When he returned to England after his first visit to Lourdes, so vast was the array of impressions it conjured up before him that he tells us 'to describe it would be to describe Christianity.' As strenuous as he was when foraging for mind food, so active was he in providing the world with his thought. With pen and tongue he proceeded at a tremendous rate. Here, too, rapidity seemed to have been a necessary condition of his work. 'I can't write,' he tells us, 'except at full pressure.' At another time, he says: 'I must have unceasing work.' When writing *By What Authority?* he often clung to his desk for the space of ten hours a day. He had a veritable craving for self-expression in books which sometimes became almost irresistible, the current of desire bearing him along to the confines of powerlessness. When he lectured, press reporters had few idle moments to indulge in. He conveyed the impression of one engaged in a breathless verbal chase after the lightning rush of his ideas. The ceaseless demand for activity which such a fund of energy occasioned was often too much for his mental and physical powers of endurance. Times of terrible *ennui* and depression frequently set in, when the soul became a 'very tender raw thing, with all its fibres stretched to agony.' It was to offset this periodic exhaustion that a marked desire for change, for a novelty, which would, in some measure, relieve one faculty, though it set another working, was seen in his character.

Without this underlying fact to furnish an explanation, his life would oftentimes seem to display strange paradoxes and inconsistencies. He led an active career, yet liked an allotted time far from the ways of 'the madding crowd.' He loved conversation and silence. He could soar to an 'ecstasy of contentment' and drop to the depths of gloom. A state of coma might dull him or a flame of enthusiasm fire him. The warmth of romance might enshroud him or the coldness of logic envelop him. And so he was a man of whom everyone said everything. But the calm of a single purpose underlay the surface restlessness. That purpose never flagged and his system never rested. The strength of the latter proved unequal to that of the former, and he spent himself in the effort to realize it. 'His enormous activity . . . quickly ruined the delicate instrument which his soul was bound to use ; nor can we be other than grateful that he was spared at least this—to be as eager as ever in his inmost spirit for work and labour, and then to find that the sheer mechanism was worn out ; that the hand was growing too heavy to take up the pen or raise itself in the pulpit ; that the very brain was too worn-out to produce the vehicle for the thought.'¹

JAMES F. CASSIDY.

¹ *Life of Monsignor R. H. Benson*, C. C. Martindale, S.J., p. 443.

A MISSIONARY NUN OF EARLY CHRISTIAN IRELAND

By J. B. CULLEN

THE materials of history, which supply us with so many facts and incidents concerning the lives of our national saints, reveal comparatively little regarding the first Celtic nuns of Ireland. But it is evident from the terse records handed down to us of the earliest Christian missionaries that holy women, whose lives were consecrated to virginity and devoted to practices of prayer and charity, existed almost from the dawn of Christianity in this country. In further proof of this, the example of those servants of Christ, few though they may have been, arrested the thoughts of kindred souls, in whose hearts its spiritual influence must have been working silently, and foreshadowed the remarkable fact, recorded very early in the mission of St. Patrick, which tells us so many virgins, the daughters of kings and chiefs, came to receive the veil and holy habit of religion at his hands that 'he could no longer count them.'

While we regret that so little is told beyond the names and lineages of our virgin saints, we can hardly blame the ancient scribes who compiled the early annals of the Irish Church for this seeming omission. Of the hidden lives of those holy women the annalist would have had probably little to chronicle, since many of them spent their days in solitude, perhaps in some cell by the sea-shore, or in some lonely retreat on the mountain-side, remote from the world they had striven to forget. In their abodes of solitude it would seem, as time passed on, they were joined by other holy companions, desirous of following in their footsteps and imitating their virtues. From the lives of holy men who

were contemporaries of these first virgin saints of our race we gather, here and there, some fragments of information relating to the primitive sisterhoods formed in the early Christian period of the country. To those sources we are indebted for the stray gleams of light that enable us to weave together the narrative of the life of St. Mo-Edana (or Modenna), who was undoubtedly one of the first pioneers of the religious life among the women of Ireland. This remarkable saint was a native of Ulster, and is said to have been born in the territory of Conaille in the first years of the fifth century. There is an incident in her early life, repeated in some of the acts of contemporary saints, that tends to show that Mo-Edana had received the light of Christianity previous to the mission of St. Patrick. When she resolved to consecrate herself to a life of virginity, and withdrew from the world, she was joined by nine holy women, one of whom was a widow, having a son of tender years, named Luger. The boy being so young at the time, that our Saint, in her spirit of excessive charity, was unwilling that he should be separated from his mother, and as we are told, 'she adopted the child as her own.' At this early time, we may remark, there was, as yet, no regular system of religious or conventual life in Ireland. With the object of obtaining spiritual direction and guidance in the way of life they had chosen, after a little time Modenna and her companions left their native district, directing their footsteps towards the west of Ireland, where, on one of the islands of Aran, a holy monk named Ibar had just founded with a few followers a monastic settlement. This celebrated man was connected with one of the ruling chieftainages of Ulster, but had spent many years of his life in Rome and southern Europe, where he was converted to Christianity, and subsequently entered the monastic state.

After his return to his native country the fame of his wonderful sanctity and learning soon spread afar, and attracted many of his countrymen (who were still pagans) to visit his island-monastery—perhaps, through curiosity,

to ascertain what the new religion taught. Moreover, it is not unlikely that the holy abbot Ibar, in earlier years, was acquainted with the family from which Modenna sprung—since both belonged to the same province. It was natural, therefore, that our virgin Saint and her associates became desirous of seeking his spiritual counsels and direction. In the vicinity of Ibar's settlement the little primitive community (the first company of nuns Ireland ever saw) remained for some time. Under the salutary instruction of their holy preceptor, Modenna and her sisterhood were trained in the system of religious life and in the observance of the rule he laid down for their guidance. Here, also, the boy Luger, of whom we have previously spoken, was prepared for the position he was destined to fill, by the call of God, in after years—for we read of him that he became one of the most remarkable Bishops of Tirconnell.

Some time later on, St. Modenna returned to her own country and dwelt for a while in the neighbourhood of Carlingford Lough. Meanwhile, Ibar had removed his monastery to the south-eastern coast of Ireland, and founded his celebrated school on a little island which lay within the kingdom of Hy-Kinsellagh, of which territory his brother-in-law was then ruler.

The site of the new foundation of St. Ibar was about two and a half miles (N.E.) from the present town of Wexford, and is known as Begerin Island, adjacent to the mouth of the River Slaney. Thither Modenna and her nuns eventually followed him. Through the influence of Ibar, a grant of land was bestowed on her by the king of this territory, at a short distance from Begerin, on the right bank of the Slaney,¹ for the erection of her convent and the maintenance of her community. As the Faith spread in this district, numbers of holy souls sought admission to her sisterhood in such numbers that she obtained permission to establish another religious settlement

¹ At a place then called Ard-Conays.

somewhat higher up on the opposite bank of the river. At this part of our Saint's life many miracles are said to have been vouchsafed by Almighty God in answer to her prayers. Among the rest, it is related, that in a season of great drought, when the rivers ran dry and the springs failed, there was widespread distress and threatened famine. In their calamity the people besought the saintly abbess to intercede for them with Heaven that the impending tribulation might be averted. In answer to her petition, it is recorded, the waters of the river rose, the springs burst up afresh, and a copious fall of rain soon restored the withering crops.

Even at this early period St. Modenna seems to have been imbued with that wandering missionary spirit for which the saints of our race were so remarkable in later centuries. At the immediate time of which we write, St. Patrick's mission was only in its commencement. The great Apostle did not arrive on our shores for some decades of years after the coming of St. Ibar—who is consequently styled one of the four pre-Patrician missionaries of Ireland. This makes the sequence of Modenna's life most interesting, since we learn that, having passed many years in Hy-Kinsellagh, she was impelled by a desire to carry her spiritual labours farther afield. In her ardour for the salvation of souls, and having appointed a substitute to guide her two religious settlements on the banks of the Slaney, she set out with a few companions and moved on towards Ulster, fixing her next abode in Faughart, near Dundalk, in the present county of Louth. Of this part of her life it is narrated that her days were spent in performing acts of charity, teaching the ignorant, and in visiting the poor and sorrow-stricken, while, in fulfilling the duties of her holy rule, in practices of prayer and pious exercises, her sanctity and fervour were the envied example of her community. She is said never to have looked on the face of man, and when appearing abroad seldom raised her eyes.

¹ Probably the locality now known as Kilmanan.

On one occasion, a legend tells, the Saint was pursued by a rude soldier, and had to seek safety in the branches of a tree. Understanding that it was the beauty of her eyes that attracted her assailant, she plucked them out and cast them to him! Then, the legend runs on to say, the soldier was filled with remorse and repented of his wickedness. At the close of the story it is told how the Saint, being led (possibly by some passing wayfarer) to a tiny streamlet close at hand, she bathed her sightless sockets—when her eyes were restored! At the scene of this miracle the waters of the spring burst up with redoubled force, and became the main tributary of the sacred stream, now so well known to pilgrims at Faughart, and to which, even at the present day, the blind-stricken have recourse in their affliction. There is much in the foregoing legend that reminds us of the attributes and miracles of another Irish virgin—St. Odelia of Alsace (German-France)—who, like our Saint at home, was the special advocate of the blind. Moreover, we are inclined to think, if the old traditions of Faughart pilgrimage were elucidated, the memories of St. Modenna, jointly with those of St. Brigid, would be found to connect with the same sacred stream, since her festival (July 6) falls within the season when this old-time devotion is so popular.

A little later on, our Saint retired to a lonely spot at the foot of Slieve Gullion, where, at Killeevy, three miles from Newry, the remains of her little oratory may still be seen. However, this must have been restored or re-built in a later period (long after the death of its patron), since at the south side of the little chapel a round tower stood till the beginning of last century. The latter structures belong to the interval between the seventh and tenth centuries.

Notwithstanding the various places with which our Saint was identified in Ireland up to this part of her life, Modenna moved again, but now forsaking her native country she crossed over to Scotland. In her ardour and zeal in the service of Christ the dangers of the sea did not



deter this heroic soul—at a time when voyages between Ireland and the sister countries had to be undertaken in the frail, hide-covered skiffs which were then only available. The most important foundations associated with her name in Scotland were at Chilnecase (in Galloway), Dumbarton, Dundeval, and Dunpeledar—the three latter being in the kingdom of Strathclyde. She is also said to have founded a church on the site of Edinburgh Castle, and at Longforgan, near Dundee. The historian Capgrave writes that in North Britain, as in Ireland, this early missionary saint led a most holy and penitential life, full of charity and good works. Learned antiquarians of Scotland have, in latter days, successfully identified our Irish Saint Modenna, as Medanan, or Edana—the forms in which her name appears in the Breviary of Aberdeen. This identification has led to an important discovery. ‘Edinburgh,’ writes the late Cardinal Moran, ‘is commonly regarded as having been so called from an ancient fort erected by King Edwin, but long before that monarch’s time St. Edana’s sanctuary was a place of pilgrimage, and it is, truth to tell, that from this virgin saint of Ireland that the modern names of Maiden Castle and Edinburgh are derived.’¹ The life of the sainted Queen Margaret of Scotland bears out this tradition. She caused the ancient oratory of the citadel to be restored and from the continuous hours of prayer she spent within its walls the shrine came afterwards to be called ‘Queen Margaret’s chapel.’ It is to this saintly woman that Shakespeare evidently refers in the lines :—

The Queen
 Oftener upon her knees than on her feet,
 Died every day she lived.²

Queen Margaret had a great devotion to the Irish saints who had laboured in Scotland, and caused some of their ancient shrines to be re-built, notably those of Iona, which she had restored at her own expense. St. Edana’s chapel,

¹ *Irish Saints in Britain*, by Card. Moran. ² ‘Macbeth, Act IV. Scene 3.

in the Castle of Edinburgh, to which we have just been referring, is said by antiquarians to be the oldest ecclesiastical structure in Scotland.¹

St. Modenna, according to the Scottish authorities, died in Longforgan, near Dundee, in the year 516. She cannot, however, be said to have been laid to rest in a foreign land, like so many of our missionary saints—since, in the Ages of Faith, bonds of holiest friendship existed between the people of Scotland and Ireland. Of her many foundations at home and in the sister country Faughart seems to have been the one dearest to Modenna's heart. Even after death she watched over its welfare—since it is told that, in a vision, our Saint appeared to her third successor to impart certain advice regarding the discipline of her nuns, and warn the Abbess of her own approaching death. In the annals of this convent many favours were recorded to have been obtained through the intercession of its sainted foundress.

This cursory sketch will, we hope, revive an interest in the sacred scenes on which Modenna laboured—whether on the shores of Carlingford Lough, by the banks of the Slaney, at Killeevy or Faughart, where her memories are entwined with those of our national patroness, St. Brigid. In the coming days of the Irish Revival her history as a pre-Patrician nun of Ireland will, we trust, find a worthy place in the literature as well as in the grateful hearts of her countrymen. Her life, like that of so many of our early Irish saints, shows that the sacrifice of home, country, and kindred was counted as trifling by those who became pilgrims and missionaries for the sake of Christ.

J. B. CULLEN.

¹ The chapel, after the Reformation, was suffered to fall into decay, being for long used as a powder magazine. It was, however, beautifully restored and re-edified by the late Queen Victoria, in her Jubilee year (1887).

MISSIONARY FATHERS OF THE MOST BLESSED SACRAMENT

AN IRISH INDIGENOUS CONGREGATION

BY W. H. GRATTAN FLOOD, Mus.D., K.S.G.

ALTHOUGH the Golden Jubilee of the foundation of the Missionary Fathers of the Most Blessed Sacrament or *Missionarii Sanctissimi Sacramenti* (M.S.S.), was celebrated at the House of Missions, Enniscorthy, in October, 1916, yet, on account of the great world war and other causes, the celebration was shorn of the pomp rightly due to such a unique event in the history of the religious Congregations in Ireland. The disturbed state of the country not a little contributed to the decision to have a quiet celebration, and not many outside the diocese of Ferns were aware of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the House of Missions at Enniscorthy. On this account, a brief sketch of the history of this remarkable Irish Congregation of Secular Priests, living in community, a Congregation still waxing strong, in its fifty-sixth year, may be acceptable to the readers of the I. E. RECORD.

Let it first be stated that the House of Missions is an Irish indigenous Congregation, and has the distinction of being the only institution of its kind in Great Britain and Ireland; in fact, it may be described as *sui generis*, as far as the British Isles is concerned. Other religious Orders in Ireland—the Franciscans, Dominicans, Carmelites, Austin Friars, Jesuits, Vincentians, Redemptorists, Marists, Oblates, etc., are of foreign origin. But the Missionary Fathers of the Most Blessed Sacrament, whose affix is M.S.S., can claim to be exclusively Irish, and to have been founded by a saintly Irish Prelate, the Most Rev. Dr. Furlong, Bishop of Ferns, in the year 1866.

Bishop Furlong, who had been a brilliant Professor of Theology at Maynooth College, had long planned a foundation of 'certain members of the secular clergy living in community, who, by means of devotional exercises, by the study of sacred subjects, and by the cultivation of the ecclesiastical virtues, would render themselves even more efficient for the holy ministry of conducting missions and retreats to the Faithful.'¹ Accordingly, in the late summer of 1866, Dr. Furlong determined to plant a new spiritual centre in the diocese, and invited four of his priests to undertake the formation of his new foundation in Enniscorthy.

The four self-sacrificing priests who nobly responded to the call of their Bishop, and, in imitation of the Apostles of old, without scrip or staff, set out on this enterprise for the salvation of souls, determined loyally to carry out the apostolic views of Dr. Furlong, were: Rev. Michael Warren, C.C., Enniscorthy; Rev. Abraham Brownrigg, St. Peter's College, Wexford; Rev. Thomas Cloney, C.C., Wexford; and Rev. James Cullen, C.C., Wexford. These four good priests made an eight days' Retreat at Milltown Park (Dublin), under the guidance of Rev. Aloysius Sturzo, S.J. (a great master of the spiritual life), prior to taking up the new foundation, and, at length, on the 17th October, they took up temporary residence in a large house on Templeshannon Quay, with Rev. M. Warren as Superior. Not long afterwards this house, proving unsuitable, was abandoned for a more suitable residence on Castle Hill, but in a few years, through the munificence of the late Richard Devereux, K.S.G., a really fine range of buildings, including residence (House of Missions), and House of Retreats, on a glorious site, at the foot of Vinegar Hill, of '98 fame, was erected, at a cost of over £4,000. Meantime, the Fathers were given charge of the public chapel attached to the then newly-erected Convent of Mercy, and Holy Mass was celebrated therein for the first time on Christmas

¹ Statutes of the Community.

Day, 1866. This little chapel (twice enlarged in subsequent years) serves as a chapel of ease for the congregation 'over the bridge,' and also for penitents who may wish to avail of the services of the Missionary Fathers, to whom Bishop Furlong gave special faculties for the Confessional, as also ordinary parochial faculties, permitting them to administer the Last Sacraments.

The first four Missionary Fathers entered with the utmost zest into their labours; and the success of the missions and retreats given by them throughout the diocese of Ferns, in 1867, acclaimed the new foundation as Heaven-sent: *Digitus Dei est hic*. In addition to missionary duties, sodalities were established in the three convents, and a special Conference was started for the Cotmen, under Father James Cullen's direction. Further, in 1868, the Fathers were appointed Chaplains of the District Lunatic Asylum, and subsequently they became Chaplains to the Loretto Convent. In 1874, the venerable founder approved of the development to give retreats and missions in other dioceses, with the stipulation that Ferns was always to have first claim.

Between the years 1869 and 1873 the infant community had four accessions, namely, Fathers William Whitty, Sylvester Cloney, James Busher, and Michael Kelly—but the holy founder's death, on November 12, 1875, was a serious loss. Yet, again, did the *digitus Dei* manifest itself, because some months later their first Superior, Rev. Michael Warren, was called to preside over the See of Ferns, and was duly consecrated Bishop, by Cardinal Cullen, on May 7, 1876.

The name of Bishop Warren will for ever be associated with the revival of the Total Abstinence Movement in the diocese of Ferns, a movement into which Father James Cullen, M.S.S., threw himself heart and soul, ultimately developing, after Father Cullen had joined the Jesuits, into the 'Pioneer' organization. Bishop Warren passed away, after a lingering illness, on April 22, 1884.

Father Abraham Brownrigg was second Superior of

the House of Missions (of which he had been one of the founders and first bursar) from 1876 to 1884. He wrote out in elegant Latin the Rules and Constitutions, and gave unstinted labour in seeing after the completion of the building as well as internal organization. Nor did he spare himself in the giving of missions, while he also conducted successful retreats at Maynooth College, All Hallows College, Clonliffe College, and elsewhere. His years of apostolic toil in the vineyard marked him out for a more exalted position, and at length he was consecrated Bishop of Ossory, on December 14, 1884.

Rev. William Whitty was third Superior, from November, 1884, to January, 1897, and though never very robust, accomplished a great deal of work in an unostentatious way. He was subsequently parish priest of Newtownbarry, and was made Archdeacon of Ferns, a position which he occupied till his lamented death, on July 1, 1914.

Meantime, among the accessions to the new Congregation were : Rev. John Lennon, Rev. John Roche, Rev. James Quigley, Rev. Lawrence Kinsella, and Rev. Henry W. Cleary. The last-named had to leave, owing to ill-health, in November, 1886, and went to Ballarat (Australia), and was consecrated Bishop of Auckland, on August 21, 1910. Another co-worker in the House of Missions, Rev. Michael Kelly, was selected to be Rector of the Irish College, Rome, in June, 1891, and was consecrated Coadjutor-Archbishop of Sydney on August 15, 1901, succeeding Cardinal Moran as Archbishop in 1911.

Rev. John Lennon was fourth Superior, from February, 1897, to 1906. He was appointed parish priest of Rathangan in March, 1906, and was transferred to the parish of Gorey in 1916, being also made Canon and Vicar-General of Ferns. He retired from parochial work in June, 1921.

Rev. James Quigley was fifth Superior, from March, 1906, to April, 1908, when he was appointed parish priest of Castlebridge, being subsequently (1914) admitted into the Chapter. He died on June 19, 1920.

Rev. John J. Rossiter was sixth Superior, from 1908 to 1918. Shortly after his appointment a new development was sanctioned by Bishop Browne, namely, the admission of a limited number of priests extern to the diocese, with full privileges of membership. One of the first to avail of this new development was Rev. Robert Stephenson, of the diocese of Ossory, who laboured as a Missionary Father from September, 1898, to October, 1914, when he was recalled by his Bishop and appointed Dean of St. Kieran's College, Kilkenny. Another extern priest was Rev. Maurice O'Connell, from the diocese of Cloyne, who laboured as a Missionary Father from 1909 to 1916, when continued ill-health compelled his retirement. His recent death evoked much sorrow among all those who knew of his strenuous work.

The régime of Father Rossiter was marked by a further development in the missionary field, and the Fathers gave successful retreats and missions in various parts of England, Scotland, and Wales, while the zealous Superior responded to an invitation to the United States to give a series of lectures and sermons in Chicago, Iona, Pittsburg, Notre Dame, New York, and other centres.

Through Father Rossiter's exertions, the beautiful little Chapel of St. Senan (Shannon Hill) was enlarged, thoroughly renovated, painted, and decorated (having been previously supplied with hot-air pipes under Father Lennon) between the years 1908 and 1916. He also renovated the Community Chapel, and erected an exquisite Memorial window, representing Bishop Furlong presenting a Monstrance (typifying devotion to the Most Blessed Sacrament) to the four founders of the Congregation.

On October 17, 1916, the Jubilee of the House of Missions was celebrated, the ceremonies being honoured by the presence of four Bishops and a large gathering of the clergy. Two of the surviving founders—Most Rev. Dr. Brownrigg,¹

¹ Since this article was in type Father Cullen, S.J., passed peacefully away on December 6, 1921. His death—which evoked universal regret—leaves Bishop Brownrigg the last surviving member of the original community.

Bishop of Ossory, and Rev. James Cullen, S.J.—were the central figures, and appropriate sermons were preached by Bishop Hackett of Waterford, and by Father Robert Kane, S.J.

On November 12, 1918, in accordance with the new Code of Canon Law, an election was held (under the Presidency of the Most Rev. Dr. Codd, Bishop of Ferns) for a new Superior, consequent on the retirement of Father John Rossiter, who had completed two terms of office, with the result that Father Patrick Murphy was elected.

Rev. Patrick Murphy, M.S.S., seventh Superior of the House of Missions, studied successively at St. Peter's College, Wexford, the Irish College, Rome, and Holy Cross College, Clonliffe, and entered the Congregation in August, 1900. His labours all over Ireland are well known, and he has been closely identified with the Gaelic League, and other movements for the spiritual and temporal uplifting of the nation.

At present (June, 1919) the community consists of Very Rev. P. Murphy, Superior ; Rev. John J. Rossiter,¹ Rev. Matthew Keating, Rev. Richard Walsh, Rev. James Sinnott, Rev. Thomas Drea, Rev. Martin Healy, and Rev. John Lyng. The three last-named are from the diocese of Ossory, and have already done good work. In addition to the actual members there are students now pursuing their College studies in Maynooth and Rome, who, in course of time, will join the community.

The House of Missions is an Institute founded on strict community lines. Whilst its members are simply secular priests, and the Institute a purely diocesan one, yet its domestic discipline is modelled on that of religious Communities. Like Religious, the Fathers have all things in common : their daily exercise of prayer and meditation, the daily recital of the Divine Office in Choir ; their studies in the privacy of their rooms, and periods of silence. From half-past five o'clock in the morning till ten o'clock at night,

¹ Father Rossiter was appointed P.P. of Gorey in July, 1921, in succession to Canon Lennon.

the various devotional exercises of the day and works of the sacred ministry are in detail provided for in the *Horarium*, which is identically the same as that first drawn up by the holy founder. Special courses of studies for the younger members, lessons in elocution, and classes for preparation of sermons for missions and retreats, a theological conference for the whole community, held once a week, insure due attention to sacred studies, and to the making of efficient missionaries.

In works of zeal, the Missionary Fathers have, for the past fifty years, a record that redounds to the credit of the Irish Church. Promotion of Devotion to the Blessed Sacrament naturally occupies first place in a Congregation that is formally placed under the special protection and guardianship of Our Lord, ever present in the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist. Hence, the Fathers, in their missions and retreats, have propagated this most excellent of devotions by establishing the Eucharistic League, by solemn exposition in the 'Holy Hour,' and by processions of the Blessed Sacrament in the parishes where they are invited to labour. In the work of temperance, the Fathers have been recognized as apostles, not only in the Diocese of Ferns, but throughout all Ireland. They were the principal organizers of the Total Abstinence Association of the Diocese of Ferns, and of the Anti-Treating League, of which one of the Fathers is the organizing Secretary. For the past twenty years the President of the Priests' Total Abstinence Union of the Diocese of Ferns (which has sixty members, including all the missionaries themselves), has been a member of the community. In recent years the 'Pioneer' Total Abstinence Association has been mainly introduced into the diocese by the Fathers, one of whom is the County Organizer. Among the spiritual works long connected with the House of Missions is the great Sacerdotal Association known as the 'Apostolic Union of Secular Priests.' Since it was first introduced into Ireland, more than a quarter of a century ago, the central direction for Ireland has been fixed at the House of Missions. The position of Irish

Assistant-General was held by Father (now Archbishop) Kelly, who was succeeded by the late Father Busher, M.S.S., and, on his lamented death, in 1910, by Father Rossiter, M.S.S. One other field of missionary endeavour to which the Fathers have recently turned their thoughts is the movement for the conversion of Non-Catholics in Ireland. With the Bishops' consent, an association, known as the 'Apostleship of One Fold,' was started, whose members promise to pray daily for the return to the Fold of the million of our fellow-countrymen who live outside the Catholic Church. The movement has been well received, and promises success. Hundreds of priests, nuns, and students have been enrolled, as well as over fifty thousand laymen, and women and children. To go into further detail of the works connected with the House of Missions would prolong unduly this short article. Suffice it to say, that the missionary scope of the Fathers has been extended to almost every diocese in Ireland, to many dioceses in England, Scotland, and Wales, and in the United States. This review cannot be brought to a more fitting close than by the repetition of the concluding passage of the panegyric, preached on the occasion of the Month's Mind of the Founder, by the eloquent Bishop of Ardagh, Dr. Conroy, who, apropos the Mission House, prayed: 'Long may this noble work endure, well may it prosper, wide may it spread, and mighty be the harvest of souls that shall be reaped from the seed cast on good soil by its founder.'

W. H. GRATTAN FLOOD.

TEMPTATION AND SIN

BY REV. DAVID BARRY

ALTHOUGH we pray in the 'Our Father' that Almighty God may not lead us into temptation, still a thought of which some sinful act is the object is not a sin, and may be so far removed from it that St. James can say : 'Blessed is the man that endureth temptation ; for when he hath been proved, he shall receive the crown of life which God hath promised to them that love Him.'¹ And the reason that no taint of sin attaches to thoughts, as such, is that they are the outcome of impressions conveyed through the senses and the imagination ; and inasmuch as our control over these lines of communication is limited, it naturally follows that they will occasionally supply material to the intellect, from which thoughts about sin will inevitably arise.

So that unless a person knows beforehand that an action or omission on his part is likely to evoke a certain idea in his mind ; and unless, moreover, the action or omission in question is voluntary, he is entirely free from responsibility for the existence of the ensuing unwholesome thought.

The sinful object mirrored in the intellect may be represented by it as desirable for the rational will, e.g., an act of hatred ; or for the sensitive appetite, e.g., an act of impurity ; or in a more or less equal degree for both, e.g., an act of revenge. But whether the object appeals directly to the lower or the higher appetite, both are almost certain, in due course, to be attracted and instinctively to embrace the suggestion of the intellect. For, as Holzmann² says : 'Quamvis delectationem rationalem a sensibili realiter

¹ St. James i. 12.

² Quoted in a note to St. Alphonsus' *Moral Theology* (Gaudé's ed.), 'de Peccatis,' lib. v. n. 7.

distingui certum sit ; propter naturalem tamen connexionem . . . quam habent inter se voluntas et appetitus sensitivus, difficillimum est illas ita separare, ut, data una, non detur reipsa et surgat etiam altera.’

So far, there has been question merely of temptation, not of sin, for free will has hitherto had no scope. Because, inasmuch as the faculty of appetite is a blind one, it is essential to freedom that both the sinfulness of the object and the fact that the will is being attracted to it, should be represented by the intellect. And it is only when this faculty acts again and shows the will as being drawn or allured in a forbidden direction, that the duty of resistance to the temptation arises. This duty consists in preventing the will from continuing to embrace the object or take complacency in it—a duty which, as we shall see, may be discharged in either of two ways.

In the event of the attraction being confined to the sensitive appetite—as it may be, for a time at least—the famous question arises as to whether, considering the matter speculatively, a person is bound to elicit a positive act of displeasure in relation to the act of his lower nature, or whether, on the other hand, he may maintain his rational will in a state of neutrality.

Now, in the first place it is an article of Catholic faith, defined by the Council of Trent,¹ that these motions of the sensitive appetite are not of themselves *mortal* sins. ‘Concupiscentia, quam aliquando Apostolus peccatum appellat, S. Synodus declarat, Ecclesiam Catholicam numquam intellexisse peccatum appellari, quod vere et proprie in renatis peccatum sit ; sed quia ex peccato est, et ad peccatum inclinatur. Si quis autem contrarium senserit, anathema sit.’ Clearly, according to this definition, these temptations are not mortal sins ; and it is the common opinion of theologians that it excludes them from the category of venial ones as well. Is there consequently an obligation, and if so, is it a grave one, to repress

¹ Sess. V. *Decret. de peccato originali* (apud S. Alphonsum, op. cit., n. 6).

them, and prevent our lower nature from acting in such a way that a parallel motion in the will would be a mortal sin? Well, there are three opinions on the subject.

One, held by Vasquez, Lessius, and others is to the effect that it would be a mortal sin to remain passive in the case, and that a person is under a grave obligation, not only to prevent his will consenting, but to employ it in an act of positive resistance to the temptation. Another view which is held only by such a limited number of theologians as not to be safe in practice, is that, supposing there is no danger of the will harbouring the sinful suggestion, there is no obligation to elicit an act of this faculty in reference to a matter which, being outside the ambit of rational powers, is of a physical and indifferent character.

The third and the common opinion, that there is a venial obligation to summon one's will power to one's assistance in the circumstances, is held by St. Thomas, St. Alphonsus, Sanchez, etc. This view is plainly taught by the Angelic Doctor, where he says: '*Peccatum mortale non potest esse in sensualitate, sed solum in ratione.*'¹ Another relevant passage of his, however, is susceptible of the interpretation that sin in such a case arises exclusively from the danger of the will consenting, as the patrons of the second view contend. These are the words in question: '*Quando jam perpendit ratio de delectatione insurgente et de nocumento consequente, utpote cum percipit homo se totaliter per hujusmodi delectationem in peccatum inclinari et in praeceptis ruere, nisi expresse resistat videtur consentire. Et tunc peccatum ad rationem transfertur per actum ejus.*'² Here the Saint would seem to base the existence of sin entirely on the danger of the rational will being affected, by having transferred to it the immoral motion in the lower faculty. Now, how is this passage to be reconciled with his former clear and definite implication that there may be a venial sin, altogether apart from such danger? Well, I think a reasonable explanation is that

¹ *Apud Sanctum Alphonsum, ibid.*

² *De Veritate, qu. 15, art. 4, in resp. ad 10.*

there is question of mortal sin when he says above ‘*percipit homo se totaliter*¹ . . . in peccatum inclinari,’ etc., and this, of course, can arise only through the will; while venial sin may easily be due to the fact that the motions of the lower appetite are not actually kept in check by positive resistance.

St. Alphonsus, too, holds that there is a light obligation, and no more, and besides referring to authorities, supports his view by two arguments. The first is in the sense that though, *ex hypothesi*, there is no great danger of the will consenting to the sinful suggestion, there is always a slight danger of this: ‘*Et ideo committitur veniale, in quantum homo cavere debet ne appetitus trahat post se voluntatem: sed haec obligatio, quando periculum consensus non est proximum est tantum levis.*’² His second argument, directed specially against those who take the most rigorous view, is that temptations—at least of a minor degree of seductiveness—are so numerous, that to insist on a grave obligation of repressing them all, would be to put an impossible burden on human shoulders: ‘*Si sub gravi,*’ says the Saint, ‘*teneremur omnes motus inordinatos positive repellere, teneremur ad impossibile: impossibile enim est, ut ait Cajetanus, omnes hos motus collective sumptos positive coercere.*’

So far for theory. In practice, all theologians agree, or rather require, that if the sensitive faculty is very much moved, and a person feels considerably affected by the temptation, he is bound not only under pain of sin, but under pain of mortal sin, to fight against it with all the will power which God has given him specially to deal with such an emergency. For as St. Alphonsus says³: ‘*Hujusmodi commotiones quando sunt vehementes, plerumque, si positive non repellantur, saltem per actum simplicis displicentiae, trahunt secum consensum voluntatis.*’⁴ And

¹ Italics mine.

² Loc. cit.

³ Ibid. n. 7.

⁴ See extract from Holzmann, *supra*, p. 51.

in truth, who can venture to assert, or to assure himself, that in such circumstances his will is quite calm and equable in the tumult of passion; or to draw the line, which is very intangible and very elusive in many cases, between a physical and a mental attraction?

The importance, then, of pitting the law of our minds against the law of our members¹ being recognized, it is of the greatest interest to know what weapons are most likely to be serviceable to us in the warfare with temptation; and whether our offensive against it should be directed to its complete annihilation, or merely to confining it within very restricted limits. Well, the theologians are at one with the spiritual writers in holding that, unless we have some very grave reason of necessity or convenience, our objective from the first—especially if the temptation be against certain Commandments—should not be confined to checking it, or keeping it in subjection, but should be directed to its complete expulsion from its mind and imagination. And when this is done successfully, the will and the lower appetite have no object on which to employ themselves, and so the temptation is at an end. The importance of drastic measures, especially in some cases, is well brought out by St. Alphonsus: ‘*Prae ceteris eos moneant (confessarii) ut in turpibus tentationibus, ne cum eis sermocinentur; sed propositum renouent se mori potius esse paratos quam assentiri Dei offensae, et ut inde statim invocent pluries cum fiducia SS. Nomina Jesu et Mariae. . . . Dixi ne mente cum tentationibus sermocinentur*’²; omnes enim spiritus magistri advertunt quod in hujusmodi sensus tentationibus sicut etiam in illis contra fidem, satius est mentem alio divertere, quam manu cum eis (ut dici solet) conflictari.’³

If, however, there is necessity or utility, which of course ought to be proportionate to the risk involved, for retaining in the mind dangerous images or representations, a

¹ St. Paul to the Romans vii. 23.

² *Homo Apostolicus*, tr. iii. n. 43.

³ Italics in original.

person is not bound to expel them, and has the alternative of making them as speculative and theoretical as possible, and neutralizing their seductive character. Some of the principal classes that may—because they must—be satisfied with this minor degree of security are summed up by St. Alphonsus¹: ‘Ubi justa causa adest, non est obligatio tale periculum vitandi, nisi certo moraliter praevideatur lapsus in peccatum. . . . Et sic excusantur *chirurgi*. . . . Sicque *parochi*. . . . Sic etiam excusantur alii qui proprium officium, puta curialis, militis, cauponis aut mercatoris, non possunt deserere sine gravi detrimento.’

The most efficient means of expelling or lessening the violence of temptation—short of removing the occasion of it, if there be one—is to fill the minds with thoughts and images showing the repulsiveness of sin in general, or the particular sin to which we are tempted, and the punishment attaching to its commission. To foster thoughts about the Passion of Christ and about death is also most effective. However, it would be the highest degree of rashness to think that, by the unaided powers of our will, we could do away with, or seriously lessen, the seductiveness of temptation, by putting in the balance against it the awful consequences of sin, unless we had God’s grace for this purpose.²

And hence the supreme importance of prayer, which helps us, in the first place, by refining and spiritualizing the mind. But chiefly, by the grace which it procures for us, and which not only directly strengthens the will but may not be entirely without effect on the sensitive faculties themselves. For, according to Pesch, ‘item in appetitu sensitivo potest Deus ordinare motus fugae et prosecutionis ea ratione, ut ad salutem conferant.’³ And a writer in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* says to the same effect: ‘It cannot be determined with certainty of faith whether to

¹ *Theol. Mor.*, lib. v. n. 63.

² ‘Deus . . . faciet etiam cum tentatione proventum, ut possitis sustinere’ (1 Cor. x. 13).

³ *Praelectiones Dogmaticae*, ‘de Gratia,’ n. 26.

the graces of mind and will, so far spoken of, should be added special actual graces affecting the sensitive faculties of the soul. But their existence may be asserted with probability.¹

Especially to be recommended are aspirations to the saints distinguished for their pre-eminent attachment to the virtue of holy purity, temptations against which are so frequent—St. Aloysius, St. Alphonsus, St. Agnes, St. Philip Neri, etc. But above all, to invoke with the lips, or better still, in the heart, the sacred names of Jesus, Mary, and Joseph is a precaution, involving neither trouble nor delay, that will bring down to us speedy and copious help from the throne of mercy and grace. Another very useful ejaculation that is richly endowed with indulgences is, ‘Sacred Heart of Jesus, I trust in Thee.’

The importance of having enlisted the help of Our Blessed Lady on our side, when we are attacked by the enemies of our salvation, was revealed by herself to St. Bridget: ‘Nullus est in hac vita tam frigidus ab amore Dei, qui si invocaverit nomen meum cum proposito poenitendi, statim diabolus ab ipso non discedat.’ And again: ‘Omnes daemones verentur hoc nomen Mariae et timent, qui audientes hoc nomen Mariae statim relinquunt animam de unguibus, quibus tenebant eam.’²

All the theologians, psychologists, and spiritual writers teach that it is only rarely that any directly physical means are very effective in overcoming temptation—unless, of course, in so far as it may be due to an occasion. And they advise that all our efforts should rather be concentrated on clearing our minds of the sinful image, or if there is good reason for not doing this, on rendering it innocuous by some of the measures I have referred to. Even there is high authority for maintaining that ‘si motus sint leves melius erit eos contemnere sine positiva resistantia,’ because ‘plerumque tales motus (leves) positiva ac reflexiva resistantia accrescunt, puraque consensus et dissensus

¹ Vol. vi. p. 692.

² Quoted by St. Alphonsus in *The Glories of Mary*, p. 374.

negatione, ac sic non reflexione evanescent ut experientia docet.' ¹

I have referred already to St. Alphonsus as teaching that one is not bound under pain of mortal sin—apart from the danger of consent—positively to resist temptations of a purely physical character, because to do so would be impossible, owing to their frequency. *Apropos* of this, it is interesting to note that the same reason is generally assigned for the more comprehensive doctrine that a person is not bound at all to avoid a danger, even of mortal sin, that is merely remote. Thus Lugo says ²: 'Regula communis et universalis est, eum qui est in occasione solum remota posse absolvi, non vero eum, qui est in occasione proxima quam non vult relinquere. Prima pars constat, quia alioquin debuimus omnes de mundo exire juxta illud S. Pauli I ad Corinth. V.' In the same sense Reuter ³: 'Cum in nullo statu tales occasiones desint, deberent omnes e mundo exire ut loquitur Apostolus (1 Cor. v. 10) si tales occasiones necessario removendae essent.' And Tanqueray ⁴ explains: 'De hac (occasione remota) nulla est specialis difficultas: tales enim occasiones ubique existere constat, ita ut ad eas vitandas necesse esset de hoc mundo exire.'

Lehmkuhl, indeed, seems very reluctant to allow a person to incur without any reason even a remote danger, implying that this is a venial sin. For he says ⁵: 'Occasionem remotam non auferre, etsi specialis causa eam subeundi non adsit, ex se *grave peccatum* ⁶ non est, modo maneat occasio remota.' And further on, in the same number, he plainly assumes that it is a venial sin to go into danger, at least unless this be very remote: '*Si valde remotum* ⁷ est certi alicujus peccati periculum, et insuper firma voluntas non peccandi, non videtur ex solo isto periculo etiam sine causa assumpto illa species virtutum laedi.'

In favour of this rigorous view it may be said that we

¹ See St. Alphonsus, *Theol. Mor.*, n. 8.

² *De Poenitentia*, disp. xiv. n. 150.

³ Lehmkuhl's edition, n. 169.

⁴ *Theologia Moralís*, iii. n. 619.

⁵ *Theologia Mor.*, ii. n. 620, ed. 11.

⁶ Italics mine.

⁷ Italics in original.

pray in the 'Our Father' to Almighty God to deliver us from temptation, without any restriction or qualification. And, in fact, Maldonatus¹ says that the sense of the petition is that God would not only help us to gain the victory over temptation, but would keep us immune from it altogether.

The majority of commentators, however, say that to ask for this would be asking for the miraculous, and that the petition is merely directed to obtaining God's help to overcome temptation. This view is more in harmony with the text of St. James i. 12: 'Blessed is the man that endureth temptation; for when he hath been proved, he shall receive the crown of life, which God hath promised to them that love Him.' The injunction of Our Lord in St. Matthew xxvi. 41: 'Watch ye, and pray that ye enter not into temptation,' seems, at first sight, to teach, not only the possibility, but the desirability and necessity of avoiding all temptations. Still, St. Jerome and many others give it the less comprehensive meaning of enjoining on us to overcome temptation and avoid sin.

However, it is to be noted in favour of Lehmkuhl's strict view, that a person in an occasion or danger of sin is not in the best position to judge whether it is proximate or remote. Moreover, the dividing line between the two is easily passed, and as we approach it there is need of the greatest circumspection.

Some theologians distinguish a class of temptations or dangers that are intermediate between slight and serious, or proximate and remote. These are temptations that are not of themselves very seductive, but on account of some weakness in a particular person's temperament or character, have a baleful influence on him, and are likely to lead him into sin. And the theologians in question hold that these temptations, though more or less free to ordinary persons, must be avoided, on pain of mortal sin, by one labouring under such disability.

¹ *In Sanctum Matthaeum*, vi. v. 13.

Thus, St. Alphonsus,¹ speaking of certain incitements to sin which, 'quamvis ipsae per se non pertingant ad mortalia,' says that nevertheless they must be avoided under pain of mortal sin, by a person of a susceptible disposition: 'quia respectu istius personae ob suam pravam dispositionem talis causa non leviter influit.' The Saint goes on to add, however, that this obligation would not exist in the case, 'si causae sint omnino leves.' And, according to Lehmkuhl,² 'ea quae ex natura sua non plane leviter neque etiam absolute graviter influunt in excitationem, ab iis sub gravi caveri debeant, qui sciunt se vere multum et vix non semper illis actionibus commoveri, pro aliis gravis obligatio non sit.'

Many other theologians, however, do not recognize the obligation in question, and hold that, apart from the danger of consent to any consequences that may accrue, a person is not bound *sub gravi*, owing to the unfortunate fact that he is a peculiarly easy prey to its assault, to avoid what is not a natural incentive to sin. To this effect are the words of Ballerini³: 'Concludamus . . . nullam veram apparere rationem, cur discedamus a communi sententia universaliter postulante actionem ex se mortalem . . . ut effectus malus sequens imputetur in causa sub mortali.'

There is no difference of opinion as to the contrary case; that, namely, where a person, owing to exceptional strength of character or phlegmatic disposition, remains unmoved in face of a temptation that is of itself, and for the generality of people, downright dangerous. All the theologians agree that such a one can ignore the existence of the temptation, though they warn us that this immunity may not be lightly assumed, but if a rule of conduct is based on it, that it should have withstood the crucial test of experience.⁴

DAVID BARRY.

¹ Op. cit., lib. iii. tract. iii. n. 484.

² Op. cit., i. n. 1029.

³ *Opus Theologicum Morale*, i. n. 593.

⁴ St. Alphonsus, op. cit., lib. vi. tract. iv. n. 452.

THE EVE OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION

BY REV. F. O'NEILL

I

NO act of the Popes, in the history of the Church, displayed its catholicity in greater relief than the Encyclical *Ubi primum*, dated from Gaeta, 2nd February, 1849. It was a request to all the Bishops to inform the Holy See what was the devotion of the faithful to the Immaculate Conception, and what was their desire to have a decision on the matter. The history and development of the devotion presents a strange contrast: The Nestorian Church, that denied Mary was Mother of God, and, *a fortiori*, that she was Immaculate, was at one time apparently more universal than any other, if not in doctrine, at least in area and variety of tongues. During the period of its greatest splendour a Chinese was its head or Katholikos, 'from 1291-1317, and ruled from China to Egypt, to Southern India, and even Java.'¹ No wonder, in face of such opposition, the devotion to the Immaculate Conception was so fervent, from the days of Ephesus, amongst the faithful in the East, whilst in the West, with the exception of Ireland and Naples, records prove the devotion was not generally practised until the eleventh century, viz.: at Cremona 1047, Rouen 1070, and at Canterbury 1093,² when, according to the Council of London, the feast was established by St. Anselm. The opposition of SS. Bernard and Thomas, the solution of the difficulties by Duns Scotus, fanned the flame. And, thanks to the Franciscans and further opposition of the Dominicans,

¹ Dr. Fortescue, *Eastern Churches*.

² Cardinal Gousset, *Immaculate Conception*, pp. 251 *et passim*.

the devotion spread like a forest fire through all France, Germany and Spain, during the fourteenth century, whilst in the East, at the same period, the Nestorian Church began to decline. Now the sect is confined to Kurdistan, between Turkey and Persia, and numbers about 150,000 ; and the Church that championed the glories of Mary knows no confines. When Pius IX was about to add another jewel to her crown, the vast majority of the Bishops were in favour of a solemn definition, in every country, with the possible exception of Germany, and even there they were not against the definability, but opposed to the opportuneness of the decree. They were haunted by the spectre of Protestantism, as they were at the Vatican Council ; and though the miraculous medal was very much abroad at the time, they could not read the handwriting, not on the wall, but across the blue vault of heaven.

Dr. Spalding, Archbishop of Sydney, accurately gauged the situation when he wrote Pius IX, ‘ that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception had sensibly developed in our time. It had made such progress and arrived at such a degree of certainty that there was room for belief the day was approaching when it would be declared and defined.’ In the Antipodes, to Dr Spalding. M. Studach, Vicar-Apostolic of Norway and Sweden, wrote that ‘ the Catholic solution would be a complete triumph for God’s Mother on earth and would fix the eyes of the Catholic world on the Holy See. . . . We five Catholic priests are exulting in the thought that the decision of the Holy See will fall as a thunderbolt on an incredulous world.’ He did not express the sentiments of the people ; but perhaps the letter of Monsignor Maigret, all the way from the Sandwich Islands, accurately describes them : ‘ The neophytes had no difficulty in admitting the belief.’ His letter was dated 6th June, 1850, and it ran : ‘ Most Holy Father,—It is very late, but with extreme joy, that I received, read, and kissed to-day the letters of your Holiness, dated Gaeta, 2nd February, 1849. Would to God it were from Rome !’

Then he tells how the Christian natives recited every day, in private, in public, everywhere, the prayer : ' Mary, conceived without sin,' stamped on the medal, and esteem it an honour to carry it. The famous apparition commemorated by the miraculous medal, confirmed by the conversion of Ratisbon, the Jewish banker, did not occur without a good reason in the mother-house in Paris of the Sisters of Charity. Rue du Bach was a centre of missionary activity. The medal was carried to all parts of the world, and in the space of twenty-four years it did more to advance the cause of the definition than all the appeals of Emperors and Bishops accomplished in centuries.

All the Missionaries-Apostolic the world over, from Norway to China, and to Oceania, were all in favour, like Monsignor Maigret, except two from the East Indies. Both did not reply until 1851 ; and one seemed to have influenced the other, just as happened in the North of France. In Maissour, thirteen out of fifteen missionaries were in favour : the Vicar-Apostolic himself was apprehensive. At Combalour the ' younger clergy were all in favour '—but the Bishop could not see his way to be so rash : ' Ce prelat n'allait pas aussi loin que les missionnaires.'¹ But, as Alzog remarked about the two Fathers at the Vatican Council that voted ' non-placet ' against over five hundred in favour of the Papal Infallibility, it proved that Vicars-Apostolic, as well as Fathers in Council, enjoyed the fullest freedom.

There was a distinguished missionary of ' the Irish Vicariate ' at Adelaide in favour of the decree, Dr. Francis Murphy, the only other name given from Australia. Before he decided, ' he had asked the grace of the Holy Spirit with all the fervour he was capable of.' Dr. Ollivier, Bishop of Evreux, North France, also ' conjured the Holy Spirit to pity his profound ignorance. He studied and he meditated a long time, in presence of the Blessed Sacrament.' He called together the most capable theologians in his diocese. The result of their united deliberations was that the proposed

¹ Gousset, *vide* Combalour.

dogma was neither seasonable nor definable! He gave two reasons: and it would be hard to say which was the more extraordinary. '1st. A number of Protestants, reconciled by our well-beloved and holy Pontiff, were in the way of returning, but nothing more capable of restraining them than the obligation imposed of ceasing to regard merely as an opinion the belief of the Immaculate Conception. 2nd. The tradition of the belief was not sufficiently explicit!' His concluding sentence proved him to be a Jansenist: 'I declare in advance that I submit myself to the judgment of the Holy See *and the majority of the Bishops.*' He never lived to see the dogma defined. The Vicar-Capitular wrote, in 1855, that the Chapter had restored the custom, which the late Bishop had suppressed, of having Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament on the altar of the Blessed Virgin Mary on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, and that the devotion had existed in Evreux diocese for over six hundred years. If poor Dr. Ollivier had read the reply of Monsignor Cosenza, Bishop of Audria, he and his 'capable theologians' would never have alleged that the tradition regarding the Immaculate Conception did not square with the Canon of Vincent of Lerins: 'Quod semper quod ubique,' etc. Dr. Cosenza was a Neapolitan. 'Naples belonged to the Byzantine Empire until A.D. 1127. The influence of Constantinople was strong in the Neapolitan Church, with the result that as early as the ninth century the Feast of the Conception was kept there.' We have seen why the Byzantine Empire was so much in favour. Opposition is often the life of devotion, as well as of trade; and parenthetically I might add: it is questionable if the Dominicans, whose loyalty to the Blessed Virgin Mary was always beyond doubt, did not do more to foster the devotion to the Immaculate Conception in the West by opposing it than the Franciscans did in supporting it. Their opposition produced a Duns Scotus and there was a reflex of the effect of the Nestorian opposition in the diocese of Audria, then in the kingdom of Naples, in the account given by Dr. Cosenza of the sentiments of the

clergy and faithful : ‘ From time *immemorial*,’ he said, ‘ all the faithful, from the highest to the lowest,—even children of both sexes from seven years—prepared themselves by a rigorous fast for the celebration of the Feast of the Immaculate Conception. The clergy were of one mind with the faithful ; and the Canons of the Cathedral, at their installation, *made a vow to defend it*. Then he gives vent to his own feelings, under the guise of proofs from tradition :—

If I do not exert myself to press for a dogmatic decree, with what countenance should I dare to seat myself at the Council of the Holy Fathers in Heaven (the sole hope that sustains me in this life). How should I stand the gaze of a Dionysius of Alexandria, of an Irenæus, of a Cyril of Jerusalem, of an Ephiphanius, of a Hippolytus the Martyr, of an Ephrem the Syrian, of an Ambrose, and a thousand others, whose united testimony form, as it were, an army in battle array ? What could I say to Chrysostom, to Augustine, to Maxim of Turin, to Theodosius of Ancyra, to Proctus of Constantinople ? The oracles of St. Paschasius and St. Germain are still heard ; the varied salutations of St. John Damascene, the praises of Peter Damien and Anselm of Canterbury. What shall I say of Jerome and Origen, of Sedulius and Bruno ; of the Liturgy of James, which salutes Mary as *Intact and Immaculate* ; of Basil and St. Mark, that repeat the same Eulogies ? Do the feasts instituted in the East, from the fifth century, not call with loud cries for a dogmatic decision ; and later on, those feasts celebrated through all the west to this day, with an ever increasing devotion in honour of the Immaculate Conception ? Surely the practice and the *living* teaching of the universal Church, the earnest requests of almost all the Bishops, the repeated desires of the most celebrated academicians, demand this definition. . . . Speak, then, most Holy Father. Let your voice make itself heard. For it is gentle and infallible. Let the happy day dawn for all the world, when, in virtue of your dogmatic and irreformable decision, we shall salute Mary for ever as Immaculate.

The ardent devotion of the people under Dr. Cosenza was, if possible, eclipsed by those of another Neapolitan diocese. The Bishop of Caviati said there was a statue of the Virgin conceived without sin before which the people, by reason of an ancient vow, bound themselves to defend the Immaculate Conception at the price of their blood. The Bishop of Callanissetta said the same : ‘ For the people have never questioned the privilege of Mary. Far from that, every year, on the 8th December, all the Sicilians

renew the vow to defend it at the price of their blood.' At Catana, Sicily, the magistrates, after they received Holy Communion, went on their knees before the high altar and renewed the same oath. At Bisignano, Naples, 'the people with free heart and good will fasted on bread and water on the vigil.' It is no wonder that such extraordinary tributes are paid to the purity of the Italian *contadini* at home or abroad.

At Taventa, Naples, the confraternities spared no expense to celebrate the feast. Every year a triduum was held in honour of Mary Immaculate, in memory of a sudden cessation of a frightful earthquake in 1743. In Italy the devotion was part of their lives. And when we come to Spain we find the same practical faith; e.g., the ordinary salutation corresponding to our 'Good morning or evening,' was 'I salute you, Mary most pure,' whilst the other answered, 'conceived without sin.' Such greetings are quite at home in the Irish language, and well did a famous Emperor, who spoke many languages, say, 'He spoke to his God in Spanish and to his servants and dogs in Saxon!'

The letter of Leo XIII, then the cautious young Archbishop of Perugia, opened a field for speculation in those days: What kind would be the discussion? Direct or indirect? Joachim Pecci, writing on the 1st November, 1849, in favour of a definition, requested the Pope 'to temper the rigour of the decree so as to avoid all pretext for new dissensions.' The Archbishop of Reggio was for no half measures: 'Let the Church strike with anathema those who dare to think Mary was conceived in sin.' Cardinal Villecourt, France, was of the same opinion, though not so fiery as the Sicilian. His reply will be given later. Michael Cavi, Archbishop of Bari, said it made him young again to think that the day had come at last when it would be no longer allowed to entertain any sentiment contrary to the dignity of the Mother of God conceived without sin. The Bishop of Guastalia, another aged prelate, wanted no delays. His

great age and illness prevented him from replying as soon as he had wished. 'If Immaculate Conception,' he said, 'is not defined, why could it not be done to-day. Is infallible authority wanting? Is light? Is right? Certainly not.' Comparing this with the letter of Archbishop Pecci, the theory of Goldsmith, that there is little left us at seventy but caution, scarcely holds.

The Bishop of Scio wanted the Pope to insert the word 'Immaculate' where it could not be omitted: in the Canon and the prayer 'Libera Nos.' Then he declared: 'If I knew that my life would be the cause of any delay to the decree of the Immaculate Conception, I would freely consent to lose it.'

At Modena, in 1853, the priests arranged to have a great number of Masses said every day to the end of the year to obtain the favour of a definition. In the same year Dr. Michael Monaghan, of Ross, wrote, what Cardinal Gousset described as an eloquent letter, which terminated, as he said, 'by these beautiful words':

Holy Father, I present my request in the attitude of a suppliant. I conjure you not to refuse your sanction to this Truth. Consider the Church confided to your care, shaken by so many storms, speak a word of assurance and this cruel tempest will calm down. Father, break the bread to your children. Sun of Faith, spread the light, scatter the darkness of error. Let the trumpet sound in Israel, and let Peter proclaim that Mary has ever been exempt even from original sin.

Then he spoke of the blessings that would follow, let us hope, in our own day:—

There is no question of doubt, but that the Virgin, whose glory will be enhanced by this new ornament, shall rise in your defence, and trampling all heresies in concert with you, she shall spread the tents of the spiritual Jerusalem, and procure for the Church other triumphs of such a kind that you may be, thanks to her, the one and only Pastor of all Christians, and that all enjoying with you here below the peace that surpasseth all understanding, we may share it again with you eternally in heaven.

All the other Irish Bishops, North and South, were of one mind with Dr. Monaghan: Dr. Cullen (Armagh),

Dr. Kelly (Derry), Dr. M'Gettigan (Raphoe), etc. Dr. Murray, Dublin,¹ who, however, in 1849, did not venture to declare for definition, on account of the opinion of some savants, though the vast majority of the clergy and faithful thought the time was come to proclaim it. Dr. French (Kilfenora) asked for a definition in 1845.

Dr. Feeny (Killala), after bearing testimony to the piety of the clergy and faithful of the diocese, where all hold the Sinless Conception as morally certain, said : 'As regards myself, I thought, and shall think, that the Blessed Virgin Mary, who was to crush the serpent's head, has never for a moment been subject to his power, that she has always been the beloved of the Holy Spirit, always beautiful and stainless, always full of grace, always and in all moments blessed amongst women who have incurred the malediction on account of original sin ; and I think that is one of the great things the Almighty has done to her.'

II

Before England was divided as at present, the Vicar-Apostolic of the Eastern district wrote, in 1849, that 'he believes a decree in favour of the Immaculate Conception would bring joy to all under his jurisdiction ; still there are some—a small number—imbued with certain Protestant prejudices, who appear slow and timid ; but their timidity should be attributed to the relations they hold with heretics rather than the perversity of a wavering faith.' The effect of these relations with rationalists, or free-thinkers, as well

¹ French text of Dr. Murray's letter : 'Il ajoutait (i.e., Dr. Murray) que la plus grande partie de son clergé pensait que la doctrine de l'Im. Concept. étant universelle le temps était venu ou elle pouvait et devait être proclamée comme article de foi. Cependant parceque plusieurs prêtres entre autres les Pères Jesuites de Dublin et *presque tous* les professeurs du Collège National de Maynooth ne pensaient pas qu'une definition dogmatique et directe fût opportune, M. Murray n'osa pas se prononcer quoiqu'il n'eut aucune doute sur la vérité de l'Immaculée Conception mais il déclarait en même temps que quel que fût le décret du Sainte siège il serait reçu avec la plus grande docilité tant par lui que par ses diocésains comme ayant été inspiré par l'esprit de Dieu.'

as with heretics, will be seen in some of the replies of the Austrian, German, and French Bishops, and even some Bishops in the North of Italy, who, however, reversed their own decision within three days, according to Cardinal Gousset.

Some of the Archbishops and Bishops in Austria and in Germany—the majority of the episcopate, to judge from the number of the replies given by the Cardinal—were so alarmed at the rashness of Pius IX that they asked His Holiness to defer the declaration, on the ground that the times were critical and the enemies of religion evil-minded—as if they could be anything else! The Bishop of Paderborn, Westphalia, for instance, seemed to stand in such awe of the Protestants, who, he says, are very numerous in his diocese, that he would not venture to declare for the opportuneness of a dogmatic decision. It seemed to him, everything considered, the definition ought not to be abandoned, but deferred until Germany became more tranquil and the Church able to enjoy more liberty. But all these difficulties were brushed aside by the Bishop of Fulde, in a virile reply to some of his priests who were not in favour of a definition just then, by reason of the stereotyped ‘difficulty of the times.’ The reply of Dr. Koett recalls a famous speech somewhere in the *Annals* of Tacitus, when the particular Cicero was carried round the camp after silencing the timid advisers, who were against the Alpine legionaries marching into Italy :—

The more the number of enemies increases [said Dr. Koett], the more insolent they become in persecuting Jesus Christ in His Church, the more the secular arm is shortened, the more Kings become powerless to defend the Church, the more necessary it is that in the combats she has to sustain against the powers of darkness, that she implore the help and protection of her who has crushed the serpent’s head, that this same Church may ever glorify, venerate, and invoke her who has obtained from her Son—to triumph over every heresy in the world.

The Bishop of Ratisbon paid a doubtful compliment to some of his clergy when he wrote the Holy Father that the ‘saner and more intelligent portion—*intelligentior et sanior*

pars—of his priests despised the vain fears of some others, who were afraid that a dogmatic definition might be made a pretext for the Innovators to accuse the Church of making innovations itself!’ To call a belief that had been reduced to practice from the early ages an innovation, or to fear that it might, certainly did not argue a high degree of intelligence. But if it is true that history repeats itself—when the doctrine of the Assumption becomes an article of faith—evil minds will affect to sneer at the ‘new’ dogma, as they did in 1854 and 1870. And the answer will be—another and grander Lourdes. The Bishop, M. Laurence, in whose diocese that famous grotto is situated, well deserved the honour. He was one of the French prelates, headed by the Cardinal Tour D’Auvergne, who asked Gregory XVI for a definition. He renewed his request on the receipt of the Encyclical in 1849, when, according to Cardinal Gousset, ‘Il rendait le plus beau témoignage de la piété de son clergé et du peuple envers l’Immaculée Conception.’ And again, in 1853, he made another pressing demand, along with his Metropolitan and the Bishop of Aire. A Prelate of the same stamp was Ven. M. Villecourt. His character fairly shines in the pages of his famous *Votum*, published a little more than a month before the decree. To judge from his work, the exact wording of the solemn definition must have been a well-guarded secret, for M. Villecourt wrote, 5th November, 1854 :—

What we desire is *not* a *mild* judgment, such as would merely indicate that the Immaculate Conception was part of the teaching of the Catholic Church ; but a *complete, perfect, and explicit* judgment, and grounded on Faith ; a decree that satisfies the wishes of fervent Catholics ; a judgment that may be most glorious for Mary, which depicts to us our Queen as the ark of salvation, dominating the heights of the waves and preserved from the universal deluge ; as the fleece of dazzling whiteness, all saturated with heavenly dew, whilst around it the earth is completely dry : as the brilliant and glorious flame that torrents of water could never extinguish, as the house of God on which the Lord had always His eyes fixed where nothing impure could enter ; a judgment *salutary* to the human race, because the Mother of Mercy will respond by new benefits to the praises and acclamations of her children, proclaiming her perpetual innocence and her unvarying exemption from all stain ; a *pacific* judgment in keeping

with all the other triumphs of Mary. For who to-day would dare to rise up against this marvellous privilege of the Virgin Mary, unless one who had lost their senses.

The Archbishop of Paris, M. Sibour, did not exactly deny that marvellous privilege, but there was no prelate who wrote so strongly against the definability and opportuneness of the decree. Pius IX, in his Encyclical *Ubi primum*,¹ asked his Grace to convey to him what was the devotion of clergy and faithful; and instead of giving a complete answer, the Archbishop gave only his own opinion and that of a few savants, in thirty-eight articles; the doubts he and they had, and made no mention of the views of the vast body of the clergy and faithful. He engaged all the arts of flattery to dissuade Pio Nono from carrying out his design: 'Your illustrious predecessors,' he said, 'have invariably refused: we cannot but doubt that the *great and well-beloved Pius IX*, treading in the footsteps of these glorious Pontiffs, will reject the same entreaties.' It was strange that Paris, whose University in its day gave the lead to Europe and the world in declaring for the Immaculate Conception, should have spoken in this way through its Archbishop.

But Paris was not the only strange exception. Rouen was another. Rouen, where the palinodes or hymns in honour of the Immaculate Conception were sung for over seven centuries; the first church in France to celebrate that Feast! The reply of the Archbishop, M. Blancart, though strongly unfavourable to a definition, is one of the most interesting in the collection, especially when it is compared with the English account of the spread of the devotion. Father Hollweek, writing in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, says: '*Martyrology of Tallaght*, compiled about 750, and the *Feilire* of St. Aengus, 800, register the Conception of Mary on the 3rd of May.' Now, behold

¹ 'Optamus autem vehementer ut majore, qua fieri potest, celeritate nobis significare velitis qua devotione vester clerus populusque fidelis erga Immaculatae Virginis Conceptionem sit animatus, et quo desiderio flaget ut ejusmodi res ab Apostolica Sede decernatur.'

the following specimen of Anglo-Saxon superiority : ' It is doubtful, however, if an actual feast corresponded to this rubric of the learned monk, St. Aengus.' Father Hollweek did not tell us how he discovered that it was ' doubtful ' if the feast and rubric corresponded or what the rubric was for !

If the Conception was not observed on the particular date assigned, what about the other feasts ? Then, growing more positive, he continued : ' The Irish feast certainly stands alone outside the line of liturgical developments. It is a mere isolated appearance, *not a living germ* ! ' The authority he quotes is Mr. E. Bishop, presumably an Englishman, one of the race that destroyed our records as well as our churches, whilst, owing to the gradual transition, imperceptible to the masses, from the Roman to their Anglican liturgies, they preserved their own.

The first question I should put Father Hollweek and Mr. Bishop : How could the Irish feast stand outside of liturgical developments when there was no other of the kind in the West at the time, viz., 750 A.D., to stand outside of ? Secondly : If it is merely an isolated appearance, that implies the feast was celebrated, and therefore a living germ ? Thirdly : What does he mean at all by saying the feast is ' not a living germ ' ? The feast implied devotion of some kind, and what about the Irish Litany ? The germ must have borne fruit, and if it did not, where did Winchester Minster hear about the Feast of the Conception ?

The only point in favour of his theory is, if the Winchester feast was celebrated on the 8th December. As regards the Irish date, Father Hollweek says : ' The scholiast adds, in the lower margin of the *Feilire*, that the Conception (*inceptio*) took place in February, since Mary was borne seven months—a singular notion found in some Greek authors.' Perhaps it is hypercritical to suggest if Greek authors make the statement as well as Irish, the notion is scarcely singular. But, passing that over, let

us hear the Archbishop of Rouen, and compare what he says in his letter to Pius IX with Father Hollweek and Mr. Bishop :—

(CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA.)

The first definite and *reliable* (N.B.) knowledge of the Feast in the West comes from England. It is found in a Calendar of the Old Minster of Winchester, dating *about* 1030. The Normans, on their arrival in England, were disposed to treat in a contemptuous fashion English liturgical observances. To them the Feast must have appeared *specifically English*. A *product* of *insular simplicity* and *ignorance*. Doubtless its public celebration was abolished at Winchester and Canterbury; but it did not die out of the heads of individuals, and on the first favourable opportunity the Feast was restored in the monasteries.

ARCHBISHOP OF ROUEN TO
PIUS IX.

The Church of Rouen claims to be the first in France to have celebrated the Feast of the Conception. This much is certain, that *English* and *French* historians usually describe this Feast under the name of the 'FEAST of the NORMANS.' So it is called in 1266 by our great Archbishop, Eude Rigaud, in his register of visits, 'VI. Id decembris in Conceptione Beatae Mariae celebravimus Missam in Ecclesia S. Severini in *Festo* NATIONIS NORMANNICAE.'

Already—a long time previous—this Feast was celebrated at Rouen and Normandy. We see in 1070 or 1071 John of Bayeux (transferred from the See of Avranches to that of Rouen) instituted this Feast amidst the great rejoicings of the people, and in 1072, on the authority of the same Archbishop, there was established at Rouen the association or academy in honour of the Immaculate Conception, called the Puy des Palinodes.

We see from this that Father Hollweek cannot have read Cardinal Gousset or he never would have penned such fanciful lines about the nefarious Normans; and we can now appreciate the value of Mr. Bishop's origins (fancy revelling in the void) that holds the first definite and reliable knowledge does not come from Ireland anyhow. The year 1066 registers the Norman Invasion—six years after the Normans were supposed to have looked on the Immaculate Conception as an 'ignorant and English devotion' they were actually singing their palinodes or hymns in honour of the Sinless

Conception! And Archbishop Blanchard beautifully describes the origin :—

So it is the reflection of a pious author, whilst in other places literary plays, called the *Puy's d'Amour*, were performed, where they crowned those who sang best the beauty of their ladies; in Normandy, on the contrary, they had the *Puy's* of the Conception of the Virgin, where prizes were given for the best pieces of poetry in honour of the Lady of Heaven. These exercises lasted to the Great Revolution. They take place no longer at this period except at the Carmelites in Rouen and the University of Caen.

F. O'NEILL.

[To be continued.]

CORRESPONDENCE

COMPILATION OF PARISH HISTORIES

REV. DEAR SIR,—I am sure you get many impertinent suggestions. This is another of them : I have an idea that a great many priests would read an article—or symposium—by a man who has gone through the mill of *compiling a diocesan or parish history*, telling others, with a like bee in their bonnet, *how to set about it*, and how not to do it. It is want of this expert knowledge that explains what I have been much struck by a paragraph in the current number of *Studies*, page 533. I know there are priests here and there all over Ireland who, like myself, are keenly interested in parochial history, and would look on the work as genuine recreation, if they knew *where to look for matter*. What generally happens is that they are either appalled by their helpless ignorance of where to begin, or spend half a life-time pottering aimlessly and fruitlessly here, there, and everywhere, accumulating a miscellaneous lot of historical rags and bones, but never discovering the numberless missing links that would make a consecutive narrative, and an interesting one. Of course, one could buy all the diocesan and parish histories, and, after years, infer from them what to look for, and where. But that is an arduous and unpopular way. Let the sages tell us in *oratione recta*. I never saw anything of the sort in any number of the I. E. RECORD : yet it is a priestly matter.

Yours very apologetically,

J. W. CANON BRADY.

Keady, Co. Armagh.

DOCUMENTS

DECREE REGARDING THE DISCHARGE OF THE OBLIGATIONS ARISING FROM MASS STIPENDS

(July 9, 1921)

SACRA CONGREGATIO CONCILII
DIOECESIS N.

CIRCA STIPENDIA MISSARUM

Die 9 iulii 1921

SPECIES FACTI.—In dioecesi N., obruti sollicitationibus etiam importunis Missarum cantandarum, sacerdotes triplici ratione satisfacere conantur oblatores, qui aegre ferunt ut Missae ab ipsis oblatae non acceptentur, vel ut foras mittantur. Etenim, obtento consensu oblatores, vel: a) pro pluribus Missis cantandis, una sola *sollemnior in ecclesia paroeciae pro coniunctis intentionibus* cantatur, ceterae autem Missae foras mittuntur ad coniunctas pariter intentiones legendae, soluta pecunia secundum taxam dioecesanam. Maior itaque pars stipendiorum addicitur illi soli Missae cantatae, ita ut, ex relatione Episcopi, celebrans et assistentes vere ditescendi occasionem habeant, praesertim cum saepe multum ultra taxam ab oblatores detur. Vel b) una Missa *sollemnis* cantatur in ecclesia paroeciali pro omnibus intentionibus receptis, cui stipendium addicitur taxa dioecesana pro cantatis Missis definitum, et reliqua pecunia piis operibus tribuitur. Vel c) una Missa cantatur sine solemnitate, pro coniunctis intentionibus, sumpto stipendio secundum taxam dioecesanam, et reliqua pecunia bonis operibus deputatur.

Primae rationi agendi, Episcopus obiicit periculum avaritiae; duabus aliis, suppressionem plurium Missarum, et incertam qualitatem operum quibus pecuniae destinantur. Omnibus autem rationibus obiicit coactionem quamdam moralem, quam subire videntur oblatores, etiam quando praerequisiti dant consensum.

Itaque proponit ut ratio ista coniungendi plures intentiones prorsus deseratur, sed simpliciter tot Missae dicantur quot fuere requisitae, facta, consentientibus oblatores, divisione stipendiorum, ita ut etiam Missae quae alio mittantur legendae, dum debuissent cantari, fruantur, pro rata parte, lautiore stipendio.

Haec porro dubia H. S. C. solvenda proponit: '1. Utrum liceat, consentientibus oblatores, componere duas vel plures intentiones Missarum cantatarum, ita ut una Missa cantata celebretur ad intentionem unitam in ecclesia oblatores, ceterae vero ad intentionem unitam legendae tradantur sacerdotibus exteris.

'2. Utrum liceat, consentientibus oblatores, duas vel plures Missas cantatas ita coniungere, ut una tantum Missa cantetur (cum maiore

sollemnitate) ad intentionem ex oblatis compositam, pro qua stipendium iuxta taxam dioecesanam sumatur, ceterum vero impedatur pro piis operibus.'

VOTUM CONSULTORIS.—I. *Applicanda principia* haec fere sunt :

a) Nemini licet onera Missarum suscipere quibus intra tempus debitum non possit eo modo satisfacere qui in acceptatione tacite promissus est. Hoc vetat ipsa iustitia naturalis, cuius praescriptum sedulo distinguendum est a regula positiva quae can. 835 statuitur.

b) Quot stipendia data et acceptata fuerint, tot Missae dicendae sunt (can. 828).

c) Cum transferuntur Missae manuales, eleemosynae acceptae integre transmittendae sunt, nisi oblatores expresse permittat aliquid retinere, aut certo constet excessum supra taxam datum fuisse intuitu personae (can. 840 § 1).

d) Ultro oblatum maius stipendium accipere licet (can. 832).

e) Oblator in mutandam pactionem consentire potest, dummodo ipse sit dominus rei, nec v.g. qua heres vel exsecutor testamenti, voluntate testatoris ligetur ; et, quando agitur de iure quaesito tollendo, omnino libere consentiat.

II. *Iudicium de praxi exposita :*

a) Si istae compositiones proponuntur oblatores de Missis iam acceptis, imprudenti sua acceptatione sacerdotes peccarunt contra principium sub littera a) recitatum. Nec *subsequens* consensus oblatores iam satis liber videtur a quadam coactione morali, quae prorsus illicita est.

b) Si vero in ipsa prima tractatione eadem proponuntur, non licet tamen pro Missa cantata, vel simpliciter vel sollemnius, addicere stipendium ultra congruam taxam dioecesanam : deficit enim ultronea maioris stipendi oblatio. Conversio autem stipendiorum in alia pia opera videtur licita, dummodo sincere procedatur, et oblatores plene dominus sit suae eleemosynae.

Inde, si ad ipsa dubia missa, ex solo praescripto legis, formaliter respondendum foret, sic videretur respondendum :

Ad I. *Affirmative*, dummodo :

a) Missae quae cantatur tribuatur stipendium quod pro una Missa cantata receptum est, addito, si maior fiat sollemnitas, supplemento quod taxa dioecesana vel usu locorum definitur.

b) Missis legendis tribuatur stipendium secundum taxam dioecesanam.

c) Restituatur oblatores quod plus solverunt pro cantu Missarum quae non erunt nisi lectae.

Ad II. *Affirmative*, dummodo oblatores dominus sit, vere consentiat, et dummodo sincere procedatur, nec aliqua negotiatio aut negotiationis *species* dissimuletur.

At satisne erit tale responsum mere formale, cum ipse Antistes, omissa iuris quaestione, pericula abusuum denuntiet et de meliore ratione rem componendi sit sollicitus ? Potius aliter practice respondendum

videtur, sicut statim dicitur, post brevem hanc animadversionem de modo proposito a Rm̃o Antistite: modus nempe iste hac parte peccare videtur, qua Missis lectis stipendium assignare censetur quod pro Missis cantatis oblatum erat, vel saltem ab hac distinctione facienda abstinet.

III. *Conclusio practica:*

Ex facti specie itaque tota difficultatis causa ea esse videtur, quod, ab uno oblatore in casu tot Missae cantandae sumuntur, ut aliis oblatoribus nullum fere locum iam esse sinant. Hi tunc omni modo instare incipiunt, de impossibilitate obtinendi Missas conqueruntur et sacerdotibus moralem faciunt necessitatem recurrendi ad compositiones, ut plures saltem quadantenus contentos reddere queant. Si res ita se habet, haec suggerenda videntur, ut, observato can. 836, a singulis oblatoribus non accipiantur nimis multae Missae cantandae in ipsa ecclesia, atque ut Missae cantandae quae transferuntur, transferantur ut *cantandae*, vel Missae legendae addantur eo numero qui respondeat excessui stipendiorum pro Missis cantandis receptorum, nisi S. Sedes permittat ut excessus iste piis dioecesis operibus assignetur. In hunc sensum super propositis dubiis mens Sacrae Congregationis in casu aperienda videtur. Quare, etc.

RESOLUTIO.—Sacra Congregatio Concilii, in plenariis Eñorum ac Revm̃orum Patrum comitiis habitis in Palatio Apostolico Vaticano, die 9 iulii 1921, omnibus attente perpensis, respondendum censuit '*Ad mentem*. Mens est ut Ordinarius prudenter studeat relatam praxim submovere; et, ad normam can. 836 Codicis iur. can., fideles moneantur per tabellam in sacrario loco patenti positam, non omnes Missas cantatas ob effluentem eorum numerum in ecclesia parociali celebrari posse, sed alibi superexstantes mitti pro celebratione.'

Facta autem de praemissis Ssm̃o Dño Nostro Benedictio Pp. XV relatione per infrascriptum S. Congregationis Secretarium in audientia insequentis diei, Sanctitas Sua resolutionem Eñorum Patrum approbare et confirmare dignata est.

I. MORI, *Secretarius*.

THE BISHOP'S POWER TO INFLICT PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF CANON 138 OF THE NEW CODE *RE* CLERICS AND HUNTING

(June 11, 1921)

[The Decree was published in the November issue of the *Acta Apost. Sedis*.]

SACRA CONGREGATIO CONCILII
GNESNEN. ET POSNANIEN.

CIRCA VENATIONEM

Die 11 iunii 1921

SPECIES FACTI.—Ordinarius Gnesnensis supplici libello Commissioni pontificiae ad canones Codicis authentice interpretandos quae

sequuntur exposuit: 'Nell'occasione dell'esercizio della caccia da parte del mio clero diocesano si sono purtroppo introdotti col tempo certi abusi. Il mio predecessore emanò un decreto in cui permise la caccia solamente sul territorio appartenente al parroco. Ma poichè gli abusi non cessavano, il clero prendeva parte alle *venationes clamorosae*, ed in una di tali caccie un sacerdote disgraziatamente ferì gravemente una persona, il Vicario Capitolare d'allora proibì la caccia al clero *sub poena suspensionis ipso facto incurrendae*. Nonostante questa proibizione alcuni sacerdoti cacciano senza avere il permesso, pretendendo che il Vescovo non abbia il diritto di proibire *totalmente* la caccia ed appoggiandosi al Codice, il quale dice nel can. 138: *venationi ne indulgeant, clamorosam autem numquam exercent*. Allo scopo di togliere questi dubbi, prego la Commissione Pontificia per l'interpretazione del Codice canonico di voler rispondermi, se il Vescovo ha il diritto di proibire la caccia al clero *sub poena suspensionis ipso facto incurrendae*, anche se questa caccia non fosse una *venatio clamorosa*.'

Verum eadem Pontificia Commissio rem ad hanc S. Congregationem detulit pro expositi dubii solutione, utpote quae potius applicationem quam interpretationem canonum respiceret.

ANIMADVERSIONES.—Huic dubio videretur respondendum cum distinctione. Non solum enim *clamorosa* venatio, at etiam *quieta sed frequens* clericis vetatur iure communi per canonem 138 Codicis, quo ipsi prohibentur, 'ne venationi *indulgeant*, clamorosam autem umquam exercent.' Ad rem Reiffenstuel, *Ius can.*, lib. 5, tit. 24, n. 6: 'Cum his iuribus aliqua venatio procul dubio sit prohibita clericis, quieta vero et moderata, raro facta, sit licita per dicta, certe saltem tumultuosa et clamorosa, nec non quieta sed nimis frequenter facta, erit prohibita.' Nec deneganda videtur Episcopo facultas inhibendi suis clericis venationem quoque *quietam et moderatam*, quae nempe raro fiat, praesertim si id exigant mores populi, qui secus scandalum pateretur, ceu evenit ex. gr. in Anglia, Germania, Gallia et in nonnullis Italiae regionibus. Codex enim nullam in allegato canone *positivam* dedit clericis licentiam venandi, sed mere vetuit clamorosam, et nimis frequentem. Itaque Episcopus qui etiam minus frequenter factam prohiberet, nullam Codicis positivam permissionem offenderet. Res immo agitur quae manifesto pertinet ad caput *De vita et honestate clericorum*, quae decretis Episcopi pressius ordinari consuevit et debet. Hinc S. Carolus Borromaeus, in suo Concilio provinciali anni 1565, part. 2 (*Acta eccles. Mediol.*, part 1, pag. 19), de clericis loquens, absolute ait: 'a venatione abstineant.' Concilium vero provinciale Coloniense anni 1860, pag. 151, de clericis statuit: 'ut prorsus sese a venatione abstineant, etiam atque etiam monemus.' Et Benedictus XV, *de syn. dioec.*, lib. 11, cap. 10, n. 9, refert. quod 'in aliquibus synodis quaecumque venatio est ecclesiasticis interdicta; in aliis sola clamorosa; in quibusdam a venatione prohibentur solis diebus festis; in aliis nulla die venari permittuntur sine Episcopi licentia; alicubi a venatione deterrentur poena suspensionis; alibi sola poena pecuniaria'; ac concludit, n. 10: 'non posse nimiae severitatis

nota adspergi synodalem constitutionem, ablegantem clericos, praecipue maiorum ordinum ac ecclesiasticum possidentes beneficium, a venationis exercitio. Etenim nonnisi temere reprehenditur constitutio, cui iuris communis sanctiones et S. Caroli Borromaei auctoritas patrocinantur.' Pariter cl. Wernz, *Ius decret.*, II, n. 214, V, haec habet: Indulgitum ius est Episcoporum statutis dioecesanis . . . suis clericis etiam *quietam* venationem *absolute* prohibendi, dummodo in poenis infligendis a nimio rigore absteineatur.'

Quod vero attinet ad poenas in clericos illicite venatores infligendas, scitum quidem est quod in veteri iure, iuxta caput 1, *de clerico venatore*, desumptum ex Concilio Agathensi anni 506 (non autem ex Concilio Aurelianensi prout legitur in Decretalibus Gregorii IX), venatio clamorosa et frequens interdicebatur sub poena suspensionis, Episcopo quidem per tres menses, presbytero per duos menses, diacono autem ab omni officio. Verum—praetermisso quod cl. Berardi observat, agi in textu Concilii Agathensis, de venatione gladiatoria, quae fit in circo—hae poenae in desuetudinem abiisse videntur, eo vel magis quod concilium Tridentinum, sess. 24, cap. 12, *De reform.*, mandavit clericis ut 'ab illicitis venationibus . . . abstineant,' quin aliqua sanctione poenali hanc prohibitionem muniret. Eitiam hodiernus Codex clericos illicite venatores nulla poena plectit.

Hisce non obstantibus nil prohibere videtur quominus Episcopus adversus huiusmodi clericos poenas decernere valeat, quum agatur de re non contra, sed iuxta ius commune; nec dubitandum sit quin Episcopus possit canones prohibentes sub nulla definita poena, sanctione poenali communire (cfr. can. 2221.) Attamen, iuxta praescriptum canonis 2218 § 1, in poenis decernendis servanda est 'aequa portio cum delicto, habita ratione imputabilitatis, scandali et damni.' Unde Santi-Leitner, *Praelect. iuris can.*, vol. 5, pag. 164, ad rem monet: 'Episcopus caveat a nimio rigore, praesertim pro prima vice, nec contra venatores clericos statuatur excommunicationem latae sententiae aut privationem clericalis privilegii. Ita respondit S. C. Concilii in *Assisiensi*, 16 martii 1622, in *Eugubina*, 16 ian. 1669 et in aliis non paucis quaestionibus relatis a Lucio Ferraris, *Bibl. can.*, v. *Clericus*, art. 6, n. 35.'

Idecirco videretur quod Episcopus posset quidem punire clericos venationi clamorosae et tumultuosae vacantes suspensione a divinis etiam *latae sententiae*, tum quia haec venatio est clericis rigorose et absolute a Codice prohibita per illa canonis verba 'venationem clamorosam nunquam exerceant,' tum quia ipsa omnino dedecet statum clericalem praesertim ob grave periculum occisionis vel mutilationis. Ex adverso sufficere videretur suspensio a divinis *ferendae sententiae* n clericos venationem quietam et frequentem exercentes, quum haec venatio minus rigorose clericis prohibeatur a Codice illis verbis: 'venationi ne indulgeant,' atque in singulis casibus quaestio instituenda esset de frequentia vel minus venationis peractae. Denique venatio quieta et moderata, quae nempe raro fit, necessitatis, utilitatis vel etiam animi relaxandi causa, non videretur plecti posse tali poena quae supponit mortalem culpam, quam nemo dixerit singulos actus venationis quietae

continere; sed ad rem sufficere remedia poenalia vel poenitentias, quae canonibus 2306 et 2313 statuuntur. Agitur enim in casu de venatione per se licita et nonnisi per accidens prohibita, propter scandalum praesertim fidelium.

Quare, etc.

RESOLUTIO.—Porro, proposito in plenariis Eñorum ac Revñorum S. C. Concilii Patrum comitiis diei 11 iunii 1921, dubio in hanc formulam concepto: 'An Episcopus prohibere possit suis clericis venationem etiam non clamorosam, poena suspensionis ipso facto incurrenda'; iidem Eñi Patres respondendum censuere: 'Negative, nisi graves et speciales adsint rationes.'

Facta autem postridie de praemissis SSñmo Dño Nostro Benedicto Div. Prov. PP. XV relatione per infrascriptum Sacrae Congregationis Secretarium, Sanctitas Sua datam resolutionem approbare et confirmare dignata est.

I. MORI, *Secretarius*.

DOUBTS REGARDING THE CELEBRATION OF THE GENERAL CHAPTER IN THE CASE OF CONGREGATIONS UNDER DIOCESAN JURISDICTION

(July 2, 1921)

[The Decree was published in October, 1921.]

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE RELIGIOSIS

DE CELEBRATIONE CAPITULI GENERALIS IN CONGREGATIONIBUS IURIS DIOCESANI

DUBIA

Huic Sacrae Congregationi negotiis Religiosorum Sodalium praepositae, circa celebrationem Capituli Generalis in Congregatione iuris dioecesani, proposita fuerunt dubia quae sequuntur:

I. Utrum ad Ordinarium domus principis Congregationis religiosae iuris dioecesani, quae iam per plures dioeceses diffusa est, spectet ius statuendi locum ubi Capitulum Generale celebrandum sit; an potius ad Moderatricem Generalem?

II. Utrum eidem Ordinario, de quo in praecedenti dubio, competat praesidere electioni Moderatricis Generalis eamque confirmare vel rescindere; an potius spectet ad Ordinarium loci in quo electio peragitur?

Porro Eminentissimi Patres Cardinales, in plenario coetu ad Vaticanum habito die 17 iunii 1921, re sedulo perpensa, respondendum censuerunt prout sequitur:

Ad I. *Negative* ad primam partem, *affirmative* ad secundam ad normam canonum 162 et 507.

Ad II. *Negative* ad primam partem, *affirmative* ad secundam iuxta canonem 506 § 4.

Facta autem relatione SSñmo Domino Nostro Benedicto divina Pro-

videntia PP. XV a R. P. D. Abbate Secretario in Audientia diei 25 eiusdem mensis et anni, Sanctitas Sua Eminentissimorum Patrum decisionem seu responsionem approbavit atque publici iuris fieri mandavit.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria Sacrae Congregationis negotiis Religiosorum Sodalium praepositae, die secunda iulii 1921.

TH. CARD. VALFRÉ DI BONZO, *Praefectus*.

MAURUS M. SERAFINI, Ab. O.S.B., *Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

THE SANCTUARY OF OUR LADY OF THE ASSUMPTION ON MOUNT ALVERNA IS HONOURED WITH THE TITLE OF MINOR BASILICA

(August 23, 1921)

LITTERAE APOSTOLICAE

SANCTUARIUM B.M.V. IN CAELOS ASSUMPTAE, IN MONTE ALVERNA, O.F.M.
DIGNITATE AC TITULO BASILICAE MINORIS COHONESTATUR

BENEDICTUS PP. XV

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.—Beatus Franciscus Assisiensis ad eorum salutem christifidelium qui, etsi in saeculo viventes, christianam perfectionem assequi cuperent, anno MCCXXI Tertium salubriter constituit Ordinem, cuius propterea sodales hoc ipso anno septimum celebrant plenum saeculum ab Ordine suo condito, cum maxima omnium bonorum laetitia, Nobisque vehementer probantibus, qui, horum sollemnium occasionem nacti, pluribus indulgentiis privilegiisque sodales eosdem auximus. Quum vero faustitatis huius velimus memoriam perpetuo manere, consilium quoque cepimus, praecipuo benevolentiae Nostrae testimonio amplificandi decus sanctuarii, quod in solitario loco, quem a monte Alverna nuncupant, curantibus Fratribus Minoribus, colaticia fidelium stipe exstructum est in honorem beatae Mariae Virginis in caelos Assumptae ac beati Francisci, sub ipsum paene sanctum Legiferi Patris obitum, qui in aspera eiusdem loci solitudine sacris stygmatis anno MCCXXIV mirabiliter decoratus est. Ad templum enim istud continensque fratrum Franciscalium coenobium, iam inde ab initio, christifideles frequentissimi confluere coeperunt; neque unquam, progressu temporis, popularium peregrinorum pietas erga illa sacra loca deferbuit, sed magis magisque in dies ad nostra usque tempora est aucta. Huc accedit quod in sanctuario ipso, bonae artis monumentis conspicuo, eorumdem religiosorum virorum opera, sacrae liturgiae caeremoniis ac ritibus continenter optimeque divinus cultus exerceatur ac foveatur. Libenter igitur a dilecto filio Mariano Libri, hodierno eiusdem coenobii Fratrum Minorum in monte Alverna Moderatore, supplicem libellum accepimus, quo, nomine proprio, Franciscalis Familiae ac sodalium omnium Tertii Ordinis Franciscanorum, nos enixe rogat, ut dignitate, titulo, privilegiisque Basilicae minoris, pro Nostra benignitate sanctuarium decorare dignemur. Quapropter, conlatis consiliis cum VV. FF.

NN. S. R. E. Cardinalibus Congregationi Sacrorum Rituum praepositis, de certa scientia ac matura deliberatione Nostris deque Apostolicae potestatis plenitudine, praesentium Litterarum vi perpetuumque in modum, enunciatum sanctuarium beatae Mariae Virgini in caelos Assumptae dicatum, in monte Alverna, intra fines Aretinae dioecesis, dignitate ac titulo Basilicae minoris honestamus cum omnibus honoribus, praerogativis, privilegiis, indultis, quae minoribus Almae huius Urbis Nostrae Basilicis de iure competunt.

Decernentes praesentes Literas Nostras firmas, validas atque efficaces semper exstare ac permanere, suosque plenos atque integros effectus sortiri atque obtinere, illisque ad quos pertinent, sive pertinere poterunt, nunc et in posterum plenissime suffragari; sicque rite iudicandum esse ac definiendum, irritumque ex nunc et inane fieri si quidquam secus super his a quovis, auctoritate qualibet, scienter sive ignoranter attentari contigerit. Non obstantibus contrariis quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum, sub anulo Piscatoris, die XXIII augusti MCMXXI, Pontificatus Nostri anno septimo.

P. CARD. GASPARRI, ~~a Secretis Status.~~

LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS BENEDICT XV TO CARDINAL VANNUTELLI CONCERNING THE SOLEMN TRIBUTE TO BE PAID TO THE MEMORY OF THE GREAT MUSICIAN, JOHN PIERLUIGI OF PALAESTRINA

(September 19, 1921)

EPISTOLAE

AD EMUM P. D. VINCENTIUM S. R. E. CARD. VANNUTELLI, SACRI COLLEGII DECANUM: DE HONORIBUS DECRETIS MEMORIAE SUMMI MUSICI IOANNIS PIERLUIGI PRAENESTINI

Signor Cardinale,

Non senza vivo compiacimento del Nostro animo abbiamo appreso che la città di Palestrina si appresta a tributare solenni onoranze alla memoria del grande maestro Giovanni Pierluigi, il quale, avendo sortito da essa i natali, ne ha reso celebre il nome in tutto il mondo.

Tali feste riusciranno senza dubbio di incitamento non solo ai cultori della musica classica, ma anche e soprattutto a coloro che zelano il decoro del tempio di Dio, poichè poche volte nella storia le idealità dell'arte e gli splendori della fede si sono fusi con così perfetta armonia, come nell'artista, la cui opera polifonica è uno degli ornamenti più preziosi della Nostra cappella pontificia e delle basiliche romane. Perciò il monumento che la città di Palestrina innalza al suo grande figlio e la celebrazione inaugurale, che si annunzia in particolare modo solenne, meritano una speciale considerazione della Sede Apostolica.

Ella, signor Cardinale, come Vescovo della dioecesi, é stata chiamata alla presidenza di onore delle feste, e certamente la Sua porpora di

principe della Chiesa, anzi di Decano del sacro Collegio, sarà per dare alle medesime un particolare splendore; ma è Nostro desiderio di prender parte anche Noi in qualche maniera a tali onoranze; e perciò, mentre abbiamo diviso di concorrere con l'offerta, che qui Le rimettiamo, alle spese sostenute da cotesta benemerita Amministrazione comunale per l'erezione del monumento, siamo lieti di autorizzar La, signor Cardinale, a rappresentare nelle feste di inaugurazione la Nostra umile Persona.

L'interesse che Noi prendiamo a questa celebrazione deve servire a promuovere sempre più quel fervore di restaurazione musicale che, iniziato felicemente dal Nostro Predecessore di venerata memoria, nel primo anno del suo pontificato, è andato diffondendosi e intensificandosi in tutte le regioni della cattolicità. Noi non vogliamo che col volgere degli anni possai tempo affievolire l'efficacia di quelle sapienti norme che il medesimo Pontefice tracciò nel motu-proprio del 22 novembre 1903 chiamandole *il codice giuridico della musica sacra*; ma vogliamo che restino nel loro pieno vigore, specialmente per ciò che riguarda la classica polifonia, la quale, come fu detto egregiamente, ottenne il massimo della sua perfezione nella scuola romana per opera di Pier Luigi da Palestrina. In tal modo i fedeli, raccolti in preghiera nel tempio di Dio, più facilmente saranno eccitati alla devozione e meglio si disporanno ad accogliere i frutti della grazia.

Con questo augurio, Ci è grato, signor Cardinale, di impartire a Lei, al Suo clero, ai promotori delle feste ed al caro popolo della dioecesi di Palestrina, l'Apostolica benedizione.

Dal Vaticano, 19 settembre 1921.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS TO CARDINAL SCHULTE, ARCHBISHOP OF COLOGNE, REGARDING THE FOUNDING OF AN INSTITUTE OF CATHOLIC PHILOSOPHY

(June 29, 1921)

EPISTOLAE

AD EMUM. P. D. CAROLUM IOSEPHUM S. R. E. PRESB. CARD. SCHULTE
ARCHIEPISCOPUM COLONIENSEM: DE CATHOLICO PHILOSOPHIAE INSTI-
TUTO COLONIAE AGRIPPINAE CONDENDO

Dilecte fili noster, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.—Optimum sane consilium, uti accepimus ex tuis officiosis litteris, nuper iniisti, comprobante Fuldensi Episcoporum conventu, Catholicum videlicet Institutum Coloniae Agrippinae condendi ut philosophia altius excolatur. Profecto nihil esse potest salubrius aut opportunius quam ut Instituta verae scientiae, idest philosophiae, condantur, ubi non modo solida atque tuta tradatur doctrina, sed etiam ea omnia dilucide explicentur, quae pertinent ad supremas veri et boni rationes, ut quaestiones variae aequae solvantur, quae sint perpetua vice

exoriturae. Iamvero philosophia, quae merito principem locum apud catholicos obtinet, illa est quam scholasticam vocant; quaeque, a sanctis Doctoribus exculta, ad eum perfectionis apicem Aquinatis ingenio evecta est, ut fere nequeat sublimius assurgere. Quam quidem ad rem exploratae plane sunt praescriptiones Romanorum Pontificum, quas dudum ratas habuit Codex iuris canonici. Non pauci quidem, uti novimus, etiam ex lectissimis Germaniae viris, iam diu censent scholasticam, quae iure *philosophia sensus communis* appellata est, in dignitatem pristinam restituendam esse, ut ea tandem, ex oblivione contemptuque emergens, non modo clericorum mentes, sed etiam eorum qui civilia munia obibunt recte fingat atque conformet. Id est sane verissime dictum; scholasticae enim studium cum sit theologiae sacrae quasi aditus, tum valde confert ad humanas scientias omne genus provehendas: principia, quibus regantur, eisdem praebendo, ac fundamenta suppeditando quibus nitantur. Nos igitur, praeclaram dilaudantes Episcopatus istius sollicitiam, id magnopere optamus ut quam citius Catholicum philosophiae Institutum excitetur idemque ad splendorem revirescat veteris studiorum Universitatis, cum duo illa doctrinae lumina Coloniae philosophiam tradebant, Albertus magnus et summus Aquinas. In hanc rem Ipsimet certam pecuniae vim libenter destinamus; ac fore confidimus ut boni omnes in Germania, qui optime semper de Ecclesia mereri soliti sunt, nunc etiam opus istud munifice iuvare velint, cum quo tantum coniungitur catholicae civilisque rei emolumentum. Auspicemque divinorum munerum et paternae benevolentiae Nostrae testem, tibi, dilecte fili Noster, singulis Germaniae Episcopis, iisque omnibus qui quomodocumque perficiendae rei operam dabunt, apostolicam benedictionem effuso animo impertimus.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum, die xxix mensis iunii, in festo Apostolorum Principum, mcmxxi, Pontificatus Nostri anno septimo.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

A CATHOLIC FACULTY OF ECCLESIASTICAL SCIENCES IS CANONICALLY ERECTED IN THE UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW

(April 4, 1920)

S. CONGREGATIO DE SEMINARIIS ET DE STUDIORUM UNIVERSITATIBUS
VARSAVIEN.

FACULTAS CATHOLICA SCIENTIARUM ECCLESIASTICARUM IN UNIVERSITATE
VARSAVIENSI CANONICE ERIGITUR CUM IURE CONFERENDI TRIPLICEM
LAUREAM

DECRETUM

Academia ecclesiastica Varsaviensi, abhinc plures annos, ob temporum iniuriam abrogata, Archiepiscopus atque Episcopi eiusdem provinciae hoc praecipuis in votis habuerunt ut, ubi primum liceret, athenaeum scientiis ecclesiasticis tradendis in ipsa Varsaviae civitate institueretur.

In conventu, igitur, diebus XII et XIII ianuarii anno MCMXVI habito, Facultatem theologicam in civili Universitate Varsaviensi, tunc erecta, ex communi consilio condendam ipsi censuere; deinceps, Polonia suo iuri restituta, in coetu dierum XI et XII mensis decembris anno MCMXVII eadem de re egerunt; ac tandem, anno MCMXIX, ab Apostolica Sede postularunt ut praedicta Facultas, complectens sacram Theologiam, Ius canonicum et Philosophiam christianam canonice erigeretur, iisque gauderet privilegiis, quibus eiusmodi Instituta iure fruuntur. Quod quidem Sacra Congregatio Seminariis ac Studiorum Universitatibus praeposita, quo par erat studio perpendit, atque Eñi eiusdem S. C. Patres Cardinales, in plenario coetu diei xxx martii MCMXX, Facultatem theologicam, cui nomen esset *Facultas catholico scientiarum ecclesiasticarum* in Universitate Varsaviensi canonice erigendam decrevere. Postridie autem hanc Eñorum Patrum sententiam, referente infrascripto Sacrae Congregationis a secretis, SSñus D. N. Benedictus PP. XV approbavit et executioni mandari praecepit. Quamobrem praedicta Facultas catholica scientiarum ecclesiasticarum in Universitate Varsaviensi canonice, praesenti decreto, erigitur atque erecta declaratur, eiusque Decano in perpetuum tribuitur ius conferendi triplicem lauream, in sacra Theologia scilicet, in Iure canonico et in Philosophia christiana, ea lege ut doctoratu nequeant donari nisi qui praevios gradus, doctrina legitimis experimentis periclitata, antea fuerint assecuti. Servatis omnino normis et praescriptionibus Sedis Apostolicae, quibus obtemperandum Archiepiscopo Varsaviensis curabit.

Datum Romae, e Secretaria Sacrae Congregationis de Seminariis et Studiorum Universitatibus, die iv aprilis, in festo Resurrectionis Dominicae, anno MCMXX.

C. CARD. BISLETI, *Praefectus*.

L. ✠ S.

✠ I. SINIBALDI, Ep. Tibernien., *a secretis*.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF LUBLIN, POLAND, IS CANONICALLY ERECTED AND ITS STATUTES APPROVED

(July 25, 1920)

LUBLINEN.

CATHOLICA UNIVERSITAS LUBLINI CANONICE ERIGITUR EIUSDEMQUE
STATUTA AD TRIENNIUM EXPERIMENTO ADHIBERI PERMITTUNTUR

DECRETUM

Poloniae Episcopi omnes in conventibus dierum XXVI et XXVII iulii anni MCMXVIII catholicam Universitatem scientiis ecclesiasticis percolendis, statim ac rerum adiuncta permetterent, Lublini excitandam constituere. Itaque ab Apostolica Sede postularunt ut Universitas catholica erigi posset, quae interea duabus existeret Facultatibus, sacrae Theologiae scilicet et Iuris canonici, eiusque scholae quamprimum alumnis paterent.

Re autem delata Sacrae Congregationi de Seminariis et Studiorum Universitatibus, Eñi Patres Cardinales, in conventu habito die prima

aprilis anno MCMXIX Universitatem catholicam erigendam censuere, quae duabus Facultatibus supradictis statim existeret, praescribentes ut apta statuta cum ratione studiorum exararentur.

Quae quidem statuta Sacrae de Seminariis Congregationi nuperime missa sunt, adiunctis precibus, ut Universitas catholica Lublinensis canonice erigeretur: atque in plenario conventu habito die xv iunii labentis anni MCMXX, iidem Eñi Patres Universitatem catholicam Lublinensem canonice erigendam decrevere cum facultate gradus conferendi ad triennium: quoad statuta vero nihil obesse quominus, cum opportunis emendationibus, ad triennium et ad experimentum adhiberentur, constituerunt.

Quam Eñorum Patrum sententiam, referente infrascripto S. Congregationis a secretis, SSñus D. N. Benedictus PP. XV approbaviti et executioni mandari iussit. Quamobrem Universitas catholica Lublinensis, duabus Facultatibus, sacrae Theologiae scilicet et Iuris canonici interim constans, praesenti decreto erigitur et erecta declaratur, cum omnibus privilegiis, quibus huiusmodi Instituta ab Apostolica Sede dependentia iure fruuntur, eiusque Cancellario tribuitur ius conferendi gradus et lauream sive in sacra Theologia, sive in Iure canonica, ea lege, ut doctoratu nequeant donari nisi qui praevios gradus, doctrina legitimis experimentis periclitata, antea fuerint assecuti. Servatis omnino normis et praescriptionibus Sedis Apostolicae.

Datum Romae, ex Secretaria Sacrae Congregationis de Seminariis et Studiorum Universitatibus, die xxv iulii, in festo S. Iacobi, anno MCMXX.

C. CARD. BISLETI, *Praefectus.*

✠ I. SINIBALDI, Ep. Tibernien., *a secretis*

L. ✠ S.

DECISION OF THE HOLY ROMAN ROTA REGARDING THE REVENUES OF A CERTAIN CHAPLAINCY

(February 26, 1921)

[The Decree was not published until November, 1921.]

SACRA ROMANA ROTA

BERGOMEN.

REDITUS CAPPELLANIAE

Benedicto PP. XV feliciter regnante, Pontificatus Dominationis suae anno septimo, die 26 februarii 1921, RR. PP. DD. Fridericus Cattani Amadori, Ponens, Petrus Rossetti et Raphaël Chimenti, Auditores de turno, in causa Bergomen.—Reditus Cappellaniae inter Rev. D. Ioseph Pezzoli, Praepositum ecclesiae S. Alexandri in Columna, quae est Bergomi, appellantem, repraesentatum per legitimum procuratorem, advocatum Angelum D'Alessandri, et Rev. D. Laurentium Togni, parochum loci vulgo Zanica, reum conventum, repraesentatum per legitimum

procuratorem, advocatum Vincentium Sacconi, sequentem tulerunt definitivam sententiam.

Gaspar Sirtori, domo Bergomo, vir pietate praestans, parvam ecclesiam in honorem S. Ioseph extra urbem in pago, quem *Capannelle* appellant, intra fines paroeciae, vulgo *Zanica*, extruxit, a qua tria milia passum distat. Ibi, venia accepta a Bergomensis Episcopo, qui prius loci parochum audierat, cappellaniam instituit, ut spirituali bono oppidanorum consuleret; ius cappellano tribuit habitandi domum ecclesiae adnexam, necnon utendi atque fruendi horto et praedio domui contiguus, praeter annuam summam quam ei assignavit. Onera autem cappellano pro tempore imposuit sive confessiones audiendi, sive pueros in christiana catechesi erudiendi, sive sacra faciendi, sive parochum adiuvandi. Haec omnia statuit instrumento die, 28, mense iulio 1836, publici notarii manu exarato, quo et iuspatronatus sibi in perpetuum reservavit. Nondum triennio transacto, Gaspar domum religiosam Minorum Conventualium, quae tunc Bergomi ad Sancti Georgii instituebatur, tamquam oblatus vel tertarius ingressus est, et, donationis contractu diei 22 mensis martii 1839, omnia bona sua atque iura huic religiosae domui cessit, nonnullis additis conditionibus, quas inter erat, ut in perpetuum servaretur cappellania ad Sancti Ioseph in paroecia, vulgo *Zanica*; Patribus istius religiosae domus ius tribuens eligendi cappellanos post mortem vel renuntiationem Ambrosii Lavelli, quem ipse elegerat, aut ex religiosis viris illius conventus, aut ex saecularibus presbyteris, prout eis placitum foret. Onera atque iura cappellano priori imposita ibi sanxit; successoribus vero onera valde minuit; facultatem PP. Conventualibus tamen dedit eadem variandi, 'col corrispondere . . . anche quello stipendio che stimerà conveniente, col poter deviare da quello in corso stabilito dal donante' (art. 14). Statuit insuper, quod si domus religiosa ad Sancti Georgii aliquando forte supprimeretur, in eius locum succederet parochus pro tempore Sancti Alexandri in Columna, quae Bergomi est paroecia, in omnibus iuribus atque oneribus, quae ad Religiosos pertinebant. Quod anno 1839 cautum fuit, adamussim evenit anno 1868. Eversiva enim lege factum est, ut religiosae domus suppressae essent, ideoque bonis omnibus conventus S. Georgii fiscus potitus sit. At parochus, qui tunc erat, S. Alexandri in Columna, iura sua, tamquam substituti, apud tribunalia expertus, sententia diei 19 mensis februarii 1874, bona omnia sibi vindicavit.

Cum primus rector cappellaniae, vulgo *Capannelle*, e vita cessisset, in eius locum a religiosa domo sacerdos Bertacchi suffectus est. Hic ab anno 1853 ad annum 1858 in officio mansit; deinde ei successit sacerdos Regazzola, qui ab anno 1859 ad annum 1863, ut antecessores, apud oratorium resedit, postea autem alio recessit, et tantum diebus festis oratorium petebat ut cappellani muneri satisfaceret. Duo priores cappellani praedio ecclesiae proximo certe gavisii sunt; at utrum cappellanus Regazzola praedii usumfructum aliquando habuerit, valde dubium est; etenim ex actis constat PP. Conventuales anno 1864 praedium illud ad diuturnum tempus locavisse. Cappellani vero, qui a parochis S. Alexandri in Columna in posterum electi sunt, numquam praedii fructus perceperunt, sed ipsi

parochi sibi detinuerunt. Anno vero 1915 parochus loci *Zanica*, animadvertens iura a cappellaniae fundatore primitus statuta minime servari, petiit ut parochus S. Alexandri praedium cappellano loci *Capannelle* cederet. Petitioni parochi S. Alexandri resistente, controversia ad Bergomensem Curiam delata est, quae primum, administrativo modo, contra petitemum resolvit; cum autem parochus loci *Zanica* instaret, ut iudicio ario modo ageretur, S. Alexandri parochus actori ius in iudicio standi denegavit; quod tamen incidentaliter sententia tribunal, die 15 iulii 1916, non admisit, nec exceptionem praescriptionis, quam postea opposuit. At sententia definitiva, quae die 25 mensis octobris 1917 lata est, actoris petitionem respuit. Hic ad nostrum Sacrum Tribunal appellavit, quod in turno diei 29 mensis iulii 1919 decrevit, dubio: 'An ad cappellanum loci *Capannelle* spectet ususfructus praedii de quo agitur' respondendum esse: 'Affirmative, sive ad cappellanum *Capannelle* spectare usumfructum praedii de quo agitur' (*A. A. S.*, XIII, 47). Ab hac sententia Rotali, parochus S. Alexandri in Columna appellationem interposuit, et quaestio hodierna die, nostro Turno definienda proponitur sub dubio: 'An Rotalis sententia die 29 iulii 1919 sit confirmanda vel potius infirmanda in casu?'

In facto.—Quoniam ex facto ius exsurgit, illud primum a nobis pendendum erit. In primis, igitur, quaeremus quonam actu cappellaniam a Gaspare Sirtorio institutam Bergomensis Episcopus probaverit. Hic invenitur actis causae convenienter insertus, et in eo legitur: '... alle istanze fattee dal sig. Giuseppe Sirtorio della parrocchia Zanica di questa Dioecesi, affine di ottenere la facoltà di erigere un pubblico Oratorio presso il Casinaggio di sua proprietà... posto fra i confini della parrocchia anzidetta... solleciti di secondare i religiosi desideri dell'oratore, del parroco locale e dei coloni domiciliati in quei contorni, siamo venuti nella determinazione di accondiscendere, come col presente, usando dell'autorità nostra ordinaria, decretando, accondiscendiamo coll'accordare facoltà al suddetto sig. Gaspare Sirtorio di Zanica di aprire ad uso pubblico l'Oratorio anzidetto sotto il titolo di S. Giuseppe... con autorizzazione di potervi celebrare la Santa Messa'; addit nonnullas conditiones, quas inter, ut orator propriis expensis sive ad oratorii conservationem, sive ad ea quae divinum cultum respiciunt, in perpetuum provideret. Hac venia ab Episcopo, die 12 decembris 1827, obtenta, Gaspar, instrumento diei 28 iulii 1836 cappellaniam instituit, in quo haec onera cappellano a se electo imposuit: 'Il cappellano, che sarà *pro tempore*, sarà tenuto ad assistere con carità e zelo in ogni giorno ed ora alle confessioni d'ambo i sessi; di fare ogni festa comandata la dottrina cristiana, in quell'ora però che non coincida colle funzioni parrocchiali; di istruire per quattro giorni alla settimana e per due ore al giorno i fanciulli di quella frazione, onde incamminarli sul retto sentiero di nostra religione, meno però due mesi all'anno che gli si concedono per vacanza; di assistere col massimo impegno e con vera carità cristiana ai poveri ammalati situati nell'intorno pel circondario circa di un miglio, ma però appartenenti alla parrocchia di Zanica, procurando loro i soccorsi tutti di nostra Cattolica Religione, e senza riguardo che il bisogno

si presenti piuttosto di giorno che di notte tempo ; di intervenire qualche volta fra l'anno alle funzioni parrocchiali di Zanica, quando però solo lo permetteranno l'età, la salute, la varietà delle stagioni, e che non abbia impegni relativi ai componenti della frazione, e finalmente permettere, sempre però previo assenso del parroco che sarà *pro tempore* in Zanica, ai limitrofi Rev. Sigg. Parrochi la somministrazione dei Sacramenti per i poveri infermi anche non addetti alla parrocchia di Zanica, ove le circostanze il comportassero, onde non lasciarli perire senza quei suffragî cotanto necessari alla salute delle anime nostre.'

' Il cappellano che sarà *pro tempore*, sarà tenuto di celebrare, in detta chiesa di S. Giuseppe, la Santa Messa tutte le domeniche ed altre feste comandate, nonchè di celebrare quotidianamente anche nei giorni feriali in quel tempo ed ora di maggior comodo ai fedeli, delle quali giornate feriali poi potrà il Cappellano scegliere ad arbitrio interpolatamente giorni 30 (trenta) all'anno, onde dar passo ai propri affari, od anche per solo oggetto di semplice vacanza, restando per questi limitatamente esonerato da una tale celebrazione, fermo l'obbligo, pel residuo tempo, dell'esatto e scrupoloso adempimento della celebrazione stessa. Circa poi l'applicazione della Santa Messa quotidiana de celebrarsi in detta chiesa di S. Giuseppe, meno i concessi giorni trenta di vacanza, dovrà il Cappellano ogni anno e in perpetuo applicarne 150 (centocinquanta) secondo la mente del Fondatore ing. Gaspare Sirtori, e le altre tutte resteranno a libera disposizione del cappellano stesso.

' Se il cappellano per fisica impotenza non potesse celebrare la Messa festiva, dovrà a sue spese farsi rappresentare da un altro sacerdote, onde nè la domenica nè le altre feste comandate, quella non manchi mai ; che se la malattia fosse duratura oltre mesi due e di un' indole tale che lo rendesse inabile al disimpegno dei caricatigli oneri, in tale verificata ipotesi, sarà tenuto di sostituire a tutto suo carico e spesa un altro sacerdote che faccia le sue veci, ma che sia però di pieno aggradimento dell'istitutore e commissari, nonchè di quel Rev. Parroco di Zanica che sarà *pro tempore* ; senza il concorso dei quali estremi non sarà mai valida nè attendibile la fatta sostituzione. Insuper institutor cappellano iniungit, ut die sabbati cuiusvis hebdomadae, necnon in festis B. M. Virginis, in oratorio rosarium recitet et in nonnullis diebus festis benedictionem impertiatur populo cum Ssño Sacramento. Congruenter autem pro his omnibus officiis sequentes eidem remunerationes atque iura concedit : ' Al cappellano che sarà *pro tempore*, oltre al diritto di percepire in numerario le sopra precisate austriache lire 1000, divise in due eguali rate, come sopra, gli viene pur assegnato di godere l'abitazione situata nel locale unito all'anzidetta chiesa, composto di una saletta e cucina a pian terreno, e di tre stanze da letto al primo piano superiore, nonchè l'orto attiguo a detta chiesa e caseggiato, tutto cinto in vivo, ed il terreno pure vicino, coltivativo-lavorativo e moronato, ascendente in tutto a pertiche locali ottantotto (88).'

His constitutis, Gaspar primum elegit cappellanum Ambrosium Lavelli, qui institutionis actui nomen apposuit, onera atque iura assumens. At anno 1839, cum Gaspar conventum Minorum Conventualium

ingressus est, omnia bona sua necnon cappellaniam ad Sancti Ioseph, eiusque dotem, eidem conventui donavit: 'La tranlazione del dominio diretto dei livelli enfiteutici ed immobili donati, viene dal sig. donante trasferita nel Convento donatario da oggi in avanti, con facoltà di farsi anche intestare dei beni riportati in donazione, sulle tavole censuarie in prova del diretto dominio concessogli. . . Intende il sig. donante di spogliarsi dei prodotti utili sugli enti tutti delle cose donate, col cedere il pieno godimento die canoni livellivi, chiesa, casa e fondi al Convento donatario, con tutte le azioni, diritti e servitù attive e passive competenti al donante e competibili agli immobili donati, intendendo esso donante di mettere il Convento donatario in di lui luogo e stato, costituendo in di lui procuratore irrevocabile, per ogni effetto di ragione e di legge il sudd. M. Rev. Padre Angelo Bigoni e di lui successori Provinciali del Convento medesimo.'

Hac bonorum suorum donatione Conventui facta, congruentia onera eidem imponit, quae, relate ad cappellaniam ad Sancti Ioseph, haec sunt: 'Sarà . . . obbligo del Convento di continuare a pagare al Cappellano della chiesa di S. Giuseppe di Zanica, eretta dal donante a beneficio del detto paese, le annue lire mille austriache (840 italiane), oltre l'uso della porzione di casa che già gode e dei frutti dei fondi assegnati pure in usufrutto, come tutto consta dalle scritture 28 luglio 1836, atti del Notaio Sig. Dr. Angelo Custode Locatelli.'

Quaestio exsurgit inter partes, utrum Gaspar Sirtorius, hic iura cappellani enumerans, loquatur tantum de Ambrosio Lavelli, idest de cappellano qui tunc erat, vel potius de cappellano pro tempore, idest etiam de futuris. Sed res quae, legenti hanc paragraphum tantum, dubia maneret, ab iis, quae immediate sequuntur, explanatur: 'Alla morte dell'attuale cappellano, rinuncia o dimissione per qualche motivo prodotto dalla non esatta osservanza degli obblighi tutti assunti dal cappellano con la succitata scrittura, di cui il donante incombe (*sic*) al Convento una severa sorveglianza per la sua esecuzione in questo caso sarà obbligo del Convento di passare tosto all'elezione di altro soggetto ad esso beneviso per bontà, prudenza e zelo delle anime, coll'imporre al medesimo quegli obblighi che crederà del caso' (loquebatur igitur in praecedenti paragrapho de cappellano a se electo, quocum anno 1836 ipse contractum inierat, non de eius successoribus, quibus nova onera hic statuit), 'oltre alli seguenti *di volonta espressa dal donante, da imporre in perpetuo anche a tutti i successori*:

'1. Di tenere ben pulita e custodita la chiesa coi relativi arredi sacri, di cui se ne farà ogni volta consegna al cappellano, mediante esatto inventario, contro regolare cauzione, perchè li conservi e li restituisca in natura tutti, salvo il naturale loro deperimento sofferto per l'uso.

'2. Di fare in perpetuo officiare decorosamente la chiesa predetta, con religioso zelo ed assiduità e come meglio crederà il Convento.

'3. Di far celebrare in essa chiesa annualmente in perpetuo cento-cinquanta (n. 150) messe, secondo la mente del donante, come praticasi attualmente, con l'obbligo al cappellano della presenza della messa in tutte le feste di precetto, nessuna eccettuata.

‘4. Di assistere con assiduità e zelo gl’infermi del vicinato, con l’obbligo di fare tutte le feste la dottrina cristiana, ed ascoltare in essa chiesa le confessioni dei due sessi con assiduità e premura. . . .

‘9. Se poi al cessare del cappellano, per alcuno dei premessi motivi, fosse in grado il Convento di supplire con un individuo dei suoi Religiosi dell’Ordine stesso agli obblighi della cappellania medesima, bene inteso anche con l’esatta osservanza dei patti sopra stabiliti, il signor donante avrebbe molto piacere fosse da esso Convento sostenuta, per maggior vantaggio del Convento stesso; in caso diverso sarà obbligato di tenere attivata in perpetuo essa cappellania, con l’elezione di un cappellano a suo genio.’

Huic paragraho respondet § 14, in qua Gaspar haec mandat: ‘Verificandosi il caso contemplato all’art. 9 (nono), di dover cioè il Convento tenere attivata la cappellania con l’elezione di un cappellano a suo genio, potrà il Convento medesimo in tal caso imporre al cappellano oltre gli obblighi contemplati nel presente istromento, quegli altri ancora che crederà del caso, col corrispondere ad esso cappellano anche quello stipendio che stimerà conveniente, col poter deviare da quello in esso stabilito dal donante.’

Ergo Gaspar in hoc instrumento, non tantum cappellanis futuris minuit onera, quae imposuerat priori a se electo, quaeque enumerantur in actu institutionis anno 1836, sed PP. Conventualibus facultatem etiam concessit, ipsis cappellanis mercedem assignandi, quae illis conveniens videretur, scilicet derogandi ab ea quam ipse statuerat.

Quaestio quae excitatur a partibus, utrum secundus vel etiam tertius cappellanus usufructu praedii gavisus sint, quamque testimoniis definire contendunt, ad hanc litem parum vel nihil refert; quia, etsi PP. Conventuales, una vel alia vice, usumfructum concesserint, non sequitur, eos potestatem amisisse, pacta, cum voluerint, immutandi. Ceterum certissimum apparet, anno 1864, dum adhuc sacerdos Regazzola rector esset cappellaniae S. Ioseph, praedii usumfructum ad illum amplius non pertinere. Patres enim Conventuales iam ab anno 1863, ad longum tempus, scilicet ad decem et octo annos praedium locaverunt. Anno vero 1868, cum domus religiosa a laica lege suppressa esset, instrumento diei 13 augusti, a publico Notario Ioanne Dolci exarato, Patres ipsi bona omnia quae a Gaspare Sirtorio acceperant, Praeposito S. Alexandri in Columna tradiderunt, prouti a donante praeceptum erat, idest cum omnibus oneribus sibi impositis contractu diei 22 martii 1839. In illo traditionis actu onera, quae tunc temporis super bonis inerant, enumerantur his verbis: ‘Oneri tutti che oggi sussistono nella maniera seguente: a) Al cappellano di S. Giuseppe alle Capannelle della Basella nel comune di Zanica, annuali lire italiane 840 (ottocento quaranta)’ (cetera sequuntur quorum nostra non interest), quin ibi ulla mentio fiat de usufructu praedii, cuius est quaestio, quem reapse parochi S. Alexandri in Columna nunquam cappellanis S. Iosephi tradiderunt; sed eis tantum annuatim stipendium libellarum italicarum 840 persolverunt.

Igitur concludi posse videtur, instrumentum donationis, anno 1839 a Gaspare conventui factae, iam ab anno 1863 usque ad praesens hanc

interpretationem accepisse, ut Patres Conventuales primum, et postmodum parochi S. Alexandri in Columna, libere possent uti, frui praedio, cuius usumfructum Gaspar ipse anno 1836 cappellano ad Sancti Ioseph assignaverat.

Quod est in iure.—Cum interpretatio, quam sive Religiosi sive parochi S. Alexandri donationi, sibi a Gaspare Sirtorio factae, dederunt, per temporis spatium quinquaginta annorum et amplius, constans fuerit atque pacifica, in sui favorem iuris praesumptionem inducit, ita ut parochus loci *Zanica*, qui illam falso niti fundamento contendit, onus incumbat quod asserit iuridice probandi. Argumenta autem, ut id evinceret (supposita validitate actus anni 1836) duo esse possunt, vel quia Gaspar Sirtorius immutare nequibat pacta, quae in actu institutionis cappellaniae statuerat, vel saltem quod, etsi haec immutare potuerit, de facto tamen non immutavit. At, primum quod respicit, erroneum esset id affirmare. Etenim actus diei 28 iulii 1836, quo Gaspar Sirtorius instituere contendit cappellaniam ad Sancti Ioseph, in se, uti constitutivus cappellaniae, imperfectus mansit: ad eius enim complementum alius actus consequi debebat, nempe designatio eorum, qui post Gasparis mortem, cappellaniae rectores eligere debuissent. Ibi, sub n. 1, legitur: ‘ Il sig. Sirtori . . . istituisce una Cappellania *colla riserva esclusiva del ius patronato*, ossia diritto di elezione del sacerdote in lui stesso, sino a che farà numero della società dei viventi, cessata la quale, la nomina del cappellano *diverra di esclusivo diritto dei commissari che verranno dal sig. Sirtori nominati con altro separato atto da lui firmato*, in concorso anche del Rev. sig. Preposito di Zanica, che sarà protettore, sotto l’espressa alternativa, che se fra li medesimi nascesse di non concordare nella scelta, in tale non creduta ipotesi, la nomina del cappellano verrà definitivamente fatta da Monsignor Vescovo di questa città e diocesi, rimossa ogni opposizione’: qui actus, a quo prior in suo valore *pro futuro* pendere debuisset, numquam a Gaspare confectus fuit. Secundo, quia a Gaspare minime observata fuit conditio ei ab Episcopo imposita, ut facultatem Gaspar haberet sive oratorium ad divinum cultum aperiendi, sive ut ibi Missa posset celebrari. Quae conditio ita exprimitur: ‘ . . . con autorizzazione di potervi far celebrare la Santa Messa, *purchè si osservino esattamente le infrascritte condizioni*: 1) che il mantenimento e l’officiatura dell’enunciato Oratorio sia a carico soltanto dell’oratore sig. Sirtori e i suoi eredi, *ritenendo all’uopo la di lui obbligatione estesa a norma di legge, con si sottoporre a speciale ipoteca un immobile*, il prodotto del quale servirà unicamente pel mantenimento dell’Oratorio medesimo, dacchè l’officiatura stessa non deve essere in aggravio nè della chiesa parrocchiale, nè della Comune.’ Quam conditionem, imponendi scilicet hypothecam super fundo, ut redditus cappellaniae suppeditearentur, Gaspar nunquam adimplevit.

Quod si contractus institutionis in se perfectus non est, sequitur in foro externo pro infecto haberi: ‘ Actus imperfectus minusque absolutus et consummatus reputatur pro nihilo: l. *si is qui quadraginta*. . . .’ (Leurenus, p. II, q. 794, 1.).

Etsi autem cappellania a Gaspare, actu anni 1836, recte fuerat

instituta, haec tamen non ecclesiastica esset, sed tantum laicalis, deest enim erectio canonica; 'Hinc, in praxi, S. Congregatio Concilii, ad dignoscendum beneficium ecclesiasticum, illudque distinguendum a Cappellania laicali seu pro Missarum legato, piaue donatione, plurimum attendit, utrum decretum Episcopi vel eius officialis emissum fuerit in erectione beneficii ipsius. Legata enim Missarum seu Cappellaniae mere laicales solummodo acceptantur ab auctoritate ecclesiastica, non autem eriguntur in titulum per decretum, seu institutionem canonicam' (Santi, *Praelect. Iur. Can.*, l. III, tit. 5, n. 10). Hae cappellaniae etiam mercenariae dicuntur, quia in illis rectores Missas celebrant recepta mercede, absque titulo. In his sacerdotes eliguntur ad adimplendum munus impositum a testatore, ita tamen ut possint ab eo removeri, et tales cappellaniae dicuntur etiam manuales et ad nutum revocabiles, quia in alterius manu stat, illas relinquere vel auferre. Nec in erectione cappellaniae proprie dictae potest testator vel fundator apponere conditionem, quod Episcopus se non intromittat ad eas conferendas, ut Gaspar in actu anni 1836 adamussim disposuit (cfr. Ferraris, *Bibl. Can.* ad verbum *Cappellania*, nn. 2, 3, 5). Hae autem, quae, proprie loquendo, potiusquam cappellaniae, dicuntur 'servitia ecclesiastica' (cfr. D'Annibale, *Summ. Theol. Mor.*, pars. III, n. 71), ab ipsis fundatoribus, dum in vivis sunt, vel etiam testamento, possunt immutari vel supprimi, cum omnino a propria voluntate pendeant, nisi fuerint a competenti auctoritate ecclesiastica legitime acceptatae, quia tunc naturam induerent contractus synallagmatici: *do ut facias*; prout habet Codex iuris canonici, can. 1544 § 2. Hoc tamen, in casu nostro, ut supra vidimus, minime evenit, cum Gaspar veniam tantum obtinuerit, ut oratorium aperiret ibique Missa celebraretur, sub conditione, quam ille non adimplevit.

Probat saltem parochus loci *Zanica*, Gasparem Sirtorium, instrumento diei 22 martii 1839, non immutasse pacta, quae statuerat in actu foundationis anni 1836?—Illud perlegentibus statim apparet Gasparem Patribus Conventualibus ad S. Georgii omnia bona sua donavisse, et ideo etiam illa quae actu 1836 in dotem cappellaniae ab eo fuerant constituta. Iis enim accurate descriptis, notarius declarat: 'Il sig. Gaspare Sirtorio in relazione a quanto si è esternato, spontaneamente e volontariamente ed in ogni miglior modo dichiara donare, come coll'atto presente dona irrevocabilmente, per patto tra vivi, al Convento dei Rev. Padri Minori Conventuali di S. Francesco che si va attivando nel Borgo S. Leonardo, nel ripetuto locale di S. Giorgio, accettante per esso il sullodato sacerdote sig. Don Pietro Sironi, quale incaricato col sudimesso mandato dal detto M. R. P. Bigoni,' inter quae nominatim indicantur 'tutti i beni immobili di ragione del sig. donante situati nelle Comuni di Grassobio e Zanica, cioè una chiesa portante il titolo di S. Giuseppe, con locale annesso ad uso di abitazione del cappellano, con orto, un altro caseggiato tutto cinto di vivo di facciata alla detta chiesa di recente fabbricato, nonchè tutto il terreno attiguo ad essa casa coltivo e moronato, ascendente in tutto a circa Pert. 88 (ottantotto). Tutto il mobile di qualunque natura esso sia, tanto di arredi sacri

della chiesa che di altra specie, esistente, anche nelle suddette case. . . . La translazione del dominio diretto dei livelli enfiteutici ed immobili donati, viene dal sig. donante trasferita nel Convento donatario da oggi in avanti, con facoltà di farsi anche intestare dei beni riportati in donazione su le tavole censuarie in prova del diretto dominio concessogli, e di potersi anche far riconoscere proprietario dei suenunciati due livelli enfiteutici dai livellari predetti. . . . Intende il signor donante di spogliarsi dei prodotti utili su gli enti tutti delle cose donate, col cedere il pieno godimento dei canoni livellivi, chiesa, casa, e fondi al Convento donatario, con tutte le azioni, diritti e servitù attive e passive competenti al donante e competibili agl'immobili donati, intendendo esso donante di mettere il Convento donatario in di lui luogo e stato.' Demum additur: 'Si aggiunge a maggior dilucidazione che li fondi, chiesa e casa come sopra donati, sono quelli ora goduti dall'attuale cappellano in effetto di scrittura 28 luglio 1836, atti sig. Angelo Custode Locatelli.' Si igitur bona quae actu anni 1836 in dotem cappellani constituta erant, anno 1839 PP. Conventualibus donata sunt, quomodo asseri potest, priorem actum non fuisse a secundo immutatum?

Insuper cum in instrumento donationis anni 1839 Gaspar expresse statuta onera perpetua imponenda cappellanis, qui Ambrosio Lavelli successuri erant, sex enumerat, dum e contra Ambrosio ipsi, in actu anni 1836, saltem decem officia imposuerat, ideo futuris cappellanis quatuor officia diminuta sunt, nempe: '1° di istruire per quattro giorni alla settimana e per due ore al giorno i fanciulli di quella frazione, onde incamminarli sul retto sentiero di nostro Religione; 2° di intervenire qualche volta fra l'anno alle funzione parrochiali di Zanica; 3° di celebrare nella chiesa di S. Giuseppe la Santa Messa quotidianamente, anche nei giorni feriali, in tempo ed ora di maggior comodo dei fedeli; 4° di farsi sostituire in caso di fisica impotenza nelle domeniche e nelle Feste comandate, a tutto suo carico e spesa, da un altro sacerdote, che faccia le sue veci': necnon die sabbato cuiusvis hebdomadae et in festis B. Mariae Virginis, rosarium in oratorio recitandi et nonnullis aliis festis sermonem habendi populo, et benedictionem cum Ssño Sacramento impertiendi. Quin ergo parochus loci *Zanica* probet, Gasparem Sirtorium onera beneficii non immutasse, potius e contra parochus S. Alexandri in Columna oppositum plene demonstrat. Quae cum ita sint, non intelligimus quomodo appellata sententia Rotalis asserere potuisset: comparatione instituta inter utrumque documentum, tenendum esse non haberi exclusionem prioris voluntatis per posteriorem, sed, ad substantiam rei quod attinet, unam cum altera coniurare amice, et deinde: 'haec onera quae latissime patent—come meglio credera il Convento—locum tenent aliorum plurimorum, quae in specie pius fundator anno 1836 statuerat': illa enim *facultativa*, haec vero *praeceptiva* erant: quasi facultas imponendi onus, idem sit ac oneris impositio!

Nos igitur recedere non posse iudicamus ab interpretatione continua atque pacifica, quam Religiosi prius, et postea parochi S. Alexandri in Columna, instrumento donationis anni 1839 dederunt, nemine

reclamante, cum de facili possent, sive cappellani S. Ioseph, sive parochi, qui per annos amplius quinquaginta loco *Zanica* fuerunt. Ipsa vero donationis verba hanc interpretationem, utpote donatoris menti conformem, plene demonstrant.

Quibus omnibus in iure et in facto perpensis, Nos infrascripti Auditores de turno, pro tribunali sedentes et solum Deum prae oculis habentes, Christi nomine invocato, decernimus, declaramus et definitive sententiamus proposito dubio: 'An sententia Rotalis 29 iulii 1919 sit confirmanda vel potius infirmanda in casu,' respondendum esse: '*Negative* ad primam partem, *Affirmative* ad secundam,' seu: 'Sententiam Rotalem diei 29 iulii 1919 esse infirmandam in casu, et ideo ad Cappellanum loci *Cappannelle* non spectare usumfructum praedii de quo agitur.' Expensas autem omnes iudiciales compensatas esse inter partes volumus, excepta taxa sententiae huius, a parochio loci *Zanica* solvenda.

Ita pronunciamus, mandantes Ordinariis locorum et ministris tribunalium ad quos spectat, ut executioni mandent hanc nostram definitivam sententiam, et adversus reluctantantes procedant ad normam sacrorum canonum, et praesertim tit. XVII, l. IV Codicis iuris canonici, *De executione sententiae*; iis adhibitis executivis et coercitivis mediis, quae magis opportuna et efficacia pro rerum adiunctis futura sint.

Romae, in sede Tribunalis S. R. Rotae, die 26 februarii 1921.

FRIDERICUS CATTANI AMADORI, *Ponens*.
PETRUS ROSSETTI.
RAPHAEL CHIMENTI.

T. TANI, *Notarius*.

ALLOCUTION OF THE HOLY FATHER AT THE SACRED CONSISTORY HELD ON NOVEMBER 21, 1921

SACRUM CONSISTORIUM

Die 21 novembris 1921, in Palatio Apostolico Vaticano, habitum es. *Consistorium secretum*, cuius acta ex ordine referuntur:

ALLOCUTIO SS. D. N. BENEDICTI PP. XV

VENERABILES FRATRES

In hac quidem renovata laetitia amplissimi conventus, multa sunt magnae Nobis curae, sed illud maximae quod est de rationibus mutuis Ecclesiam inter et civilem societatem plurifariam ordinandis. Etenim nemo est qui ignoret, post recens immane bellum, vel novas natas esse Respublicas, vel Respublicas veteres, provinciis sibi adiunctis, crevisset. Iam vero, ut alia omittamus quae huc possumus afferre, patet quae, privilegia pridem haec Apostolica Sedes, per pactiones sollemnes conventionesque, aliis concesserat, eadem nullo iure posse hasce Respublicas sibi vindicare, cum res inter alios acta neque emolumentum neque praeiudicium ceteris afferat. Item Civitates nonnullas videmus ex hac

tanta conversione rerum funditus novatas extitisse, adeo ut quae nunc est, non illa ipsa possit haberi moralis, ut aiunt, persona, quacum Apostolica Sedes olim convenerat. Ex quo illud naturâ consequitur, ut etiam pacta et conventa, quae inter Apostolicam Sedem et eas Civitates antehac intercesserant, vim iam suam omnem amiserint.

Verum si qui Rebuspublicis vel Civitatibus quas diximus praepositi sunt, velint cum Ecclesia pacisci concordiam aliis condicionibus quae mutatis temporibus melius congruant, sciant Apostolicam Sedem—nisi quid aliam ob causam sit impedimento—non recusaturam quominus ea de re cum ipsis agat, ut cum aliquot iam agere instituit. Hoc autem vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, denuo confirmamus, in pactione huiusmodi Nos minime passuros ut quidquam irrepât quod sit ab Ecclesiae alienum dignitate aut libertate; quâ quidem salvam esse et incolumem vehementer interest, hoc maxime tempore, ad ipsam civilis convictus prosperitatem.

Nullus enim negaverit rei civilis religiosaeque consensionem ad tranquillitatem publici ordinis, quod bonum est fundamentum ceterorum, non parum conferre. Etenim pax a populis, tantas in omni genere ruinas perpersis, domi forisque nimium hodie desideratur; ac tamen summo cum moerore ac sollicitudine cernimus paci sollemnibus consignatae scriptis nequaquam pacem comitatam esse animorum, nationesque fere omnes, Europaeas praesertim, magnis etiamnunc dilacerari discidiis, hisque adeo acerbis, ut ad ea sananda vehementius in dies requiratur Dei miserentis manus, in qua est *virtus et potentia . . . magnitudo et imperium omnium*.¹

Ad ipsius igitur confugiamus clementiam eamque non solum prece supplicii imploremus, sed etiam conciliare studeamus oportet, cum sanctius vitam instituendo, tum vero in calamitosos, quorum nunc ubivis maxima, si unquam alias, copia est, beneficentiae officia frequentando. Quoniam autem huius rerum omnium perturbationis, in qua versamur, ea in primis duplex est causa, quod vario ducuntur errore mentes, et quod flagrant invidia animi nimis multorum, magnificandus est *dives in misericordia* Deus qui anno vertente duplicem pariter occasionem obtulerit hominibus ad medendum utrique rei mirifice accommodatam. Sacra sollemnia dicimus anni septingentesimi ex quo et Pater legifer Fratrum Minorum Franciscus Tertiarorum suorum ordinem instituit et Fratrum Praedicatorum legifer item Pater Dominicus excessit ad Deum: nam dubitandum non est quin ex sanctissimorum recordatione virorum populus christianus excitari se senserit ad studium cultumque delapsae de caelo tum caritatis tum veritatis. Praeclare enim magnus ille Poeta catholicus—cuius ipsius memoria saecularis per hos menses iure quidem ac digne a nostris celebrata est—duorum Patriarchorum laudes uno complexus praeconio, ‘alterum caritatis ardore seraphicum, alterum, sapientiâ, cherubicae lucis splendorem’ appellat. Itaque, Deo adiuvante, instituta in eorum honorem sollemnia tanto piorum studio tantaeque frequentia peracta sunt, ut existimare liceat non ad levem

¹ Par. xxix. 12.

quamdam et fugacem inflammationem animorum ea recidissee, sed incrementum inde acceptum fidei mutuique amoris in multitudine solidum esse atque mansurum.

Quamquam vero his malis, quibus humana societas premitur, medicinam praesentem efficacemque maxime a Deo petimus, non tamen praetermittenda dicimus aut negligenda quaecumque recta ratio ususque rerum suadeat remedia et praesidia. His enim adhibendis sive remediis, sive praesidiis, communi bono consulere proprium est eorum officium qui populos regunt, tametsi eos iidem unice confidere, Dei ope neglecta, nefas est. Nos igitur perlibenter, Venerabiles Fratres, videmus complurium Civitatum legatos his diebus Washingtonum convenisse ob eam causam ut de immodicis rei militaris sumptibus minuendis inter se consultarent. Quorum consilia optamus cupimusque prosperum successum habeant, eisque ut lumine sapientiae suae Deus adsit, cum optimo quoque suppliciter precamur; neque enim solum id agitur, quod sane magnum est, ut intolerandis iam oneribus populi releventur, sed etiam, quod est maius, ut bellorum, quoad possit, pericula multo remotiora iam fiant.

DECISION REGARDING THE CLAIM OF A CERTAIN CATHEDRAL CHAPTER TO FUNERAL OFFERINGS IN NEIGHBOURING PARISHES

(July 9, 1921)

S. CONGREGATIO CONCILII

DIANEN.

IURIS FUNERANDI

9 iulii 1921

SPECIES FACTI.—Quatuor parochi civitatis Dianensis recurrentes, de Ordinarii consensu, ad hanc S. Congregationem, decertant adversus Capitulum cathedrale de iure funerandi ex parte ipsius Capituli absque obligatione solvendi parochis portionem canonicam. Allatis nimirum testimoniis Capitulum probare intendit exercitium dicti iuris ex quo, per Constitutionem apostolicam diei 25 septembris 1850, executioni mandatam decretis diei 7 iulii 1851, ipsa dioecesis Dianensis erecta fuit: ex tunc enim praetendit ecclesiae cathedralis Capitulum sese ad solam heredum vel parentem petitionem funerasse defunctos in qualibet ex novis erectis in civitate parocciis, vel insciis et inauditis parochis, quin ullam quartam funerariam iisdem persolveret.—Contrariis testimoniis parochi contendunt enunciatae praxim solummodo ab anno 1916 pro bono pacis et ad vitanda scandala toleratam ab ipsis fuisse: nunc vero postulant ut etiam in civitate Dianensi notissima ea super re praescripta Codicis serventur.

Causa de more actitata, et instantibus enixe partibus ut res ad

plenariam deferatur, quaeritur in praesenti : *An et quomodo ius funerandi competat Capitulo cathedrali in casu.*

ANIMADVERSIONES.—Quum parochi evidenter intentionem suam habeant in iure fundatam, et Codicis canonibus aperte confirmatam, onus iam recidit in Capitulum probandi quo iure et titulo particulari talia funera peragat, quae de iure communi ad parochos defuncti pertinent. Ad rem Capitulum haec argumenta affert :

Primum, cum in casu non procedatur nisi ad *petitionem heredum vel parentum*, ex hoc ipso praesumendum est defunctum *elegisse* sibi ecclesiam cathedralem utpote ecclesiam funeris, nisi contrarium probetur : huic vero electioni profecto standum erit (cfr. can. 1223). Sed contra est. Equidem ad probandam electionem sepulturae vel ecclesiae funeris nullatenus requiritur scriptum documentum vel aliqua iuris solemnitas, immo ex explicita littera can. 1226 : ‘factam electionem aut mandati concessionem *quolibet legitimo modo* probare licet’ ; quin etiam, ad normam § 2 eiusdem canonis ‘si defunctus elegerit sibi sepulturam *per alium*, hic explere mandatum suum potest etiam post mortem mandantis.’ Ast exinde hic unum sequitur, credendum quidem esse, donec contrarium probetur, consanguineis vel heredibus testantibus de voluntate defuncti quoad electionem sepulturae, vel asserentibus se de hac re mandatum accepisse a defuncto : optimo enimvero *testes* voluntatis defuncti sunt consanguinei et heredes, et probatio per testes est quidem iuridica probatio (cfr. can. 1791 § 2) ; non illud tamen sequitur, si defunctus de re nullam expresserit voluntatem, nullumque illis contulerit mandatum, consanguineorum esse talem defuncti omissionem supplere quasi praesumptum vel interpretativum mandatum habentium. Secus nullus esset casus in quo electio non intercederet, ac propterea actum esset de iuribus parochorum quae immo Codex sarta esse voluit. Aliis verbis, quum electio sepulturae extra propriam paroeciam, limitet iura et proventus parochorum, strictae evidenter interpretationis negotium est ; et quum data lex nonnisi in defuncti voluntatem facultatem electionis contulerit, nullum aliorum in eandem rem intrat arbitrium, nullique licet sepulturam pro defuncto eligere nisi legitime probaverit sibi de re mandatum fuisse.

Nec Capitulum iuvant quae opponit regia rescripta diei 11 novembris 1751 et 15 martii 1742, art. 2, relata a Salzano, *Dir. can.*, vol. II, pag. 169, ubi ex parte regis conceditur ‘libera facoltà ai moribondi e loro congiunti ed eredi di sceglieri la sepoltura’ aut inhibetur ‘che non può impedirsi ai moribondi. loro congiunti ed eredi, di eleggere la sepoltura ove vogliano’ : enimvero haec rescripta, quum non pertineant ad ius concordatum inter Apostolicam Sedem et laicam potestatem, nullius momenti sunt vel ad probandam consuetudinem generalem quae praetenditur in regno Neapolitano post ipsa inolita, dum de eadem aliunde non constat.

Alterum probationum caput ex eo petitur quod Capitulo competat cura habitualis animarum, quam actualiter gerit per Decanum. Huic asserto acriter contradicunt parochi, contententes in casu tum habitua-lem tum actua-lem curam esse penes parochum-decanum. Verum in

hac contentione intercedere quemquam non oportet : sive enim decidatur pro Capitulo, sive pro decano parochia, est 'res acta inter alios' relate ad quatuor parochos civitatis. Quod si Capitulum praetendat curam gerere habitalem non solum parociae ecclesiae cathedralis, verum etiam aliarum quatuor parociarum civitatis, rem praetendit adeo a iure communi absonam, ut ne verbis quidem congruis exprimi possit ; ac propterea oportet argumenta omnino peremptoria ad hoc assertum probandum adducere : quod in casu minime obtinet, immo vel ipse actus creationis dioecesis, capituli cathedralis et parociarum, sive silentio, sive apertis verbis, huic commento refragatur.

Praeterea, quidquid de his argumentis censendum sit, neminem fugit per eadem intentionem Capituli non obtineri, qui asserit sibi ius funerandi competere *absque onere rependendi parochis portionem canonicam* : quippe, etiam dato non concesso, iure funerandi, vel titulo electae sepulturae, subintrat perspicuum praescriptum can. 1236 'Salvo iure particulari, quoties fidelis non funeratur in ecclesia propria parociali, proprio defuncti parochia debetur portio parocialis.' Hinc Capitulum appellare cogitur ad 'ius particulare' quod in casu vigeret. Sed non meliori omine. Contendit nimirum sese praescripsisse adversus ius parochi ad portionem, praesumptione liberativa seu extinctiva, titulumque ad rem affert, regia decreta dierum 5 et 7 iunii 1755 ubi sancitur : 'Non avere il parroco alcun diritto di prendere il residuo delle cose servite nella pompa funebre, che spettano agli eredi e congiunti del defunto . . . ; che la Curia vescovile e qualsiasi altra persona ecclesiastica si astenga da qualunque esazione di quarta funeraria.' Ast haec regia rescripta, ut supra monuimus, nullum momentum in re canonica habent, nec aliud probant nisi impedimentum ad agendum et reclamandum, ex parte Curiae vel parochi ; quod impedimentum non modo non iuvat, sed immo perimit probationem legitimae praescriptionis. Itaque non restat Capitulo nisi praescriptio ex possessione absque ullo titulo. Verum neque hac ratione rem conficere potest, multiplices obstante causa. Primum, quod, iuxta communem doctrinam quam enunciat v.g. Sacra Rom. Rota, decis. 504, n. 10, part. XIV inter *Recent.* : 'ad hoc ut intret praescriptio in habentibus *tractum successivum* necessaria est petitio, repulsa et acquiescentia petentis' ; in casu agitur profecto de re habente tractum successivum, quum Capitulum teneatur toties dare portionem canonicam quoties funerat alienos : itaque probandum esset a Capitulo, se cum effectus denegasse portionem *petenti* ; quod minime praestat, cum immo testibus evincere contendat 'ch'egli (il Capitolo) non ha pagato mai la quarta funerale e che mai dal parroco fu richiesta !' Procedit itaque in casu eadem argumentatio quam saepissime adhibuit Rota, v.g. in Burgen., *funeralium* (223, ex *recent.* part. XIV), n. 9, ubi exclusit praescriptionem quartae parocialis 'quia testes non probant petitionem cum denegatione et subsequenti acquiescentia ut requiritur ad praescribendam libertatem et quasi-possessionem non solvendi.' Et ratio facile datur : quia videlicet parochia nullum *officium* est, sed tantum *facultas* exigendi portionem canonicam, ideo hi tantum casus in quibus revera petierit, conferre possunt, si denegationi acquieverit, ad probandam utilem praescriptioni possessionem.

Nec solum utilis possessio, sed in casu, tempus quoque legitimum deest. Enimvero, ut tenuit v. g. Rota in una coram Many (*Decis*, a. 1913, n. XXXIV) cum agitur de praescribendo 'contra iura paroecialia, standum est capiti *Episcopum* in VI de *praescript.* vi cuius, quando ius resistit—ut quando agitur de iuribus paroecialibus quae iuri communi nituntur—requiritur quadragenaria cum titulo *vel sine titulo immemorialis*.' At quomodo in casu constabit de *immemoriali*, si solemnibus documentis constat Capitulum ipsum conditum fuisse anno 1850-1851?

Quibus positis, nulla necessitas est sequendi partes in suis prolixis deductionibus circa testes et eorum testimonia; etsi in omnibus his favendum omnino esset Capitulo, i. e. acceptandum esset quod Capitulum profert de exercitio sui iuris ab initio, praemissa semper obstarent, quominus probatio concludens existimaretur.

Quare, etc.

RESOLUTIO.—Relata causa in plenariis comitiis Sacrae Congregationis Concilii, die 9 iulii 1921, Eñi Patres respondendum ad propositum dubium censuere:

'*Negative*, nisi agatur de sepultura legitime electa vel gentilitia, salva tamen in hisce casibus portione canonica respectivo parrocho defuncti.'

Quam resolutionem, referente infrascripto Sacrae Congregationis Secretario in audientia postridie habita, Sanctissimus D. N. Benedictus div. Prov. PP. XV approbare et confirmare dignatus est.

I. MORI, *Secretarius*.

DECREE OF THE SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE COUNCIL REGARDING THE TRANSFERENCE OF MASS STIPENDS

(April 16, 1921)

[The Decree was published in November, 1921.]

SACRA CONGREGATIO CONCILII

MONTISVIDEI

STIPENDII MISSARUM

Die 16 aprilis 1921

SPECIES FACTI.—Archiepiscopus Montisvidei supplici libello ab hac S. Congregatione solutionem postulavit insequentis dubii: 'In questa arcidiocesi di Montevideo v'è la consuetudine di far celebrare con certa solennità esteriore, novenarii e Messe gregoriane, per le quali la tassa diocesana è maggiore che per le Messe semplici, anche ad ora fissa. Sorge però il dubbio se il totale di detta tassa debba darsi ai celebranti o possa ritenersi parte di essa in favore delle parrocchie e chiese, dandone ai celebranti soltanto quello che corrisponde per lo stipendio di Messa ad ora fissa. Le ragioni del dubbio sono queste: il parroco assume

l'obbligo presso i fedeli di far celebrare dette Messe gregoriane e novenarii di Messe (siano quelle, eccetto le gregoriane, tutte insieme, di tre in tre, o successive), e quindi ha l'onere di cercare sacerdoti e ne ha la responsabilità, particolarmente delle Messe gregoriane: poichè se, per esempio, dopo certo numero queste s'interrompessero per qualunque causa, esso dovrà a sue spese farle ricominciare da capo.—Di più, dette Messe gregoriane e novene di Messe non poche volte i fedeli le fanno celebrare in luogo del funerale, ed anche con qualche solennità esteriore.'

ANIMADVERSIONES.—Quum in comperto omnino sit, ex generali lege stipendium Missarum integrum transmittendum esse ad sacerdotem celebrantem, nihil superest nisi ut ad trutinam revocemus causas a Revmo Ordinario recensitas, ut aliquid a transmittente retineri possit.

Prima ratio inde petitur quod transmittenti compensari debeat onus et forsitan labor inquirendi eos qui Missas rite celebrare velint. Verum haec ratio nimis generalis est, et a quocumque ecclesiae rectore invocari posset: scilicet, si quod onus et labor in ea inquisitione est, satis compensatur utilitate quam rectores sentiunt ex eo quod sua cuiusque ecclesiae frequentia divinorum officiorum ordinate gaudeat. Ceterum id oneris et laboris cum officio rectoris ecclesiae necessario connectitur.

Alter ratio petitur ex eo quod *suo periculo* rector tales Missas celebrandas transmittit, adeo ut ipse oneretur in conscientia si tricenaria celebratio intermittatur, etc. Sed e contrario videtur onus celebrandi Missas gregorianas, etiam singillatim commissas, ex integro refundi in sacerdotem celebrantem, qui, ad tramitem canonis 833 Codicis, non solum tenetur Missas celebrare, verum etiam alias adimplere circumstantias ac conditiones iisdem Missis adnexas. Secus enim facile irrepere possent abusus et etiam contentiones inter sacerdotem celebrantem et rectorem ecclesiae praesertim ob interruptam Missarum gregorianarum celebrationem.

Tertia quae adducitur ratio inde est quod huiusmodi tricenaria quandoque locum teneant legitimi funeris: ast, hoc quoque concesso, minime sequitur hisce Missis applicari debere can. 1237 § 2 ubi res est de propriis exsequiis. Quatenus vero haec consuetudo committendi tricenaria vel novenaria Missarum loco funeris, in ea regione satis invaluerit, consultius videretur ut, praeter Missarum eleemosynam, Ordinarius statuatur taxam pro maiore solemnitate vel iure funeris debitam, eamque ecclesiae aut eiusdem rectori seu paroco attribuat, congrue hac de re fidelibus monitis.

Quare, etc.

RESOLUTIO.—Sacra porro Concilii Congregatio in plenario Eñorum ac Rñorum Patrum coetu in Palatio Apostolico Vaticano, die 16 aprilis 1921, habito, ad propositum dubium: *An et quomodo retineri possit excessus eleemosynae Missarum in casu*, respondendum censuit.

Prout proponitur *negative et ad mentem*. Mens est: 'ut in casu exterioris solemnitatis in Missarum celebratione vel quando hae committantur loco funeris, Episcopus praefigat modicam taxam, non autem

ex eleemosynis Missarum desumendam, in compensationem pro parochis et rectoribus, monitis super hoc oblatoribus.'

Facta autem de praemissis SS^{mo} D^{ño} Nostro Benedicto div. Prov. PP. XV relatione, per infrascriptum S. C. Secretarium in audientia insequenti die habita, Sanctitas Sua datam resolutionem approbare et confirmare dignata est.

I. MORI, *Secretarius.*

DECLARATION OF THE SACRED CONGREGATION OF RELIGIOUS TO MODERATORS AND SUPERIORS OF RELIGIOUS ORDERS CONCERNING THE REVISION OF THEIR CONSTITUTION, AS PRESCRIBED BY DECREE OF JUNE 26, 1918

(October 26, 1921)

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE RELIGIOSIS

DECLARATIO CIRCA RELIGIONUM CONSTITUTIONES CODICI CONFORMATAS, S. CONGREGATIONI PRO REVISIONE SUBIICIENDAS, EX DECRETO 26 Iunii 1918.

Iam inde ab anno 1918 haec Sacra Congregatio mandavit ut omnes religiones iuris pontificii suas regulas seu constitutiones ad praescripta Codicis iuris canonici conformatas emendarent, ac textum emendatum eidem pro revisione subiicerent.

Verum non pauca obstituerunt quominus revisio expedite procederet; praeterquam quod numerus ingens constitutionum iam tempus non breve exigit pro revisione, plures ex illis quae ad Sacram Congregationem missae fuerunt, non respondent conditionibus necessariis ad hoc ut textus emendatus probari possit.

Ut haec vitentur incommoda, Sacra Congregatio monet Moderatores et Moderatrices generales religionum, nec non monialium Antistitas, ut in hoc negotio sequentia prae oculis habentur:

I. Ad hanc Sacram Congregationem mittendae sunt tantummodo constitutiones seu statuta aut quocumque alio nomine appellentur, quibus regitur religio, quorum textum a Sede Apostolica approbatum fuisse constet.

II. Cura emendandi textum Codici conformatum sit ipsi Ordini aut religioni vel monasterio, et duplex exemplar, ita emendatum, mittatur ad hanc Sacram Congregationem.

III. Emendetur textus tantummodo in iis in quibus constitutiones Codici opponuntur, vel aliquid addatur si deficiat, et adhibeantur, quoad fieri potest, verba ipsius Codicis.

IV. Si occasione huius revisionis aliqua religio velit quasdam mutationes non necessarias, seu a Codice non praescriptas, in constitutiones

inducere, hoc ne fiat in textu emendato, de quo superius, sed mittantur ad Sacram Congregationem, pro facultate obtinenda, separatae preces, in quibus et textus iampridem approbatus et textus propositus per extensum referatur, rationesque immutationem suadentes proferantur.

Petitio autem non acceptabitur ab hac Sacra Congregatione nisi immutationes in Capitulo generali fuerint discussae et approbatae. Si tamen agatur de minoribus aut de verbis substituendis, vel de abrogandis usibus qui in desuetudinem ob temporum et morum diversitatem iam abierint, aut aliis similibus, sufficiat consensus Consilii generalis.

V. Ne autem discrepantiae oriantur in textu constitutionum identico, quibus diversae domus aut monasteria sui iuris eiusdem Ordinis aut Instituti utuntur, statuit Sacra Congregatio pro talibus constitutionibus unicum emendationum textum ab omnibus et singulis domibus esse acceptandum, vel cura ipsarum domorum propositum, vel cura huius Sacrae Congregationis exaratum.

Datum Romae, ex Secretaria Sacrae Congregationis de Religiosis, die 26 octobris 1921.

THEODORUS CARD. VALFRÉ DI BONZO, *Praefectus*.

MAURUS M. SERAFINI, Ab. O.S.B., *Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

INSTRUCTION OF THE SAME CONGREGATION REGARDING THE SECOND YEAR OF THE NOVITIATE

(November 3, 1921)

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE RELIGIOSIS

INSTRUCTIO DE SECUNDO NOVITIATUS ANNO

Plures exstant religiones in quarum constitutionibus praescribitur alter novitiatus annus et facultas fit Superioribus adhibendi tyrones, eo perdurante, in operibus Instituti exercendis. Ne vero exinde aliquid detrimenti capiat tyronum religiosa informatio et abusus qui irreperere possent arceantur, haec Sacra Congregatio Negotiis Religiosorum Sodalium praeposita, occasionem nacta revisionis constitutionum singularum religionum ad Codicem conformatarum, rem diligenti studio subiecit et Eminentissimi Patres, in plenario coetu diei 17 iunii 1921, omnibus perpensis, sententiam suam aperuerunt, quae in audientia diei 25 eiusdem mensis Ss^{mo} D. N. Benedicto PP. XV relata fuit.

Sanctitas porro Sua sententiam probavit simulque mandavit, ut hac de re instructio ederetur, cui omnes et singulae congregationes religiosae, in quibus secundus novitiatus annus ex constitutionum praescripto peragitur, integre se conformare teneantur.

I. Quoties igitur constitutiones praescribant secundum novitiatus annum in eoque sinant novitios in operibus propriis Instituti se exercere, hoc liceat, salvis fundamentalibus novitiatus legibus. Ideoque

prae oculis habendum est novitiatum esse institutum ad novitiorum animos informandos, in iis quae ad vitia extirpanda, motus animi compescendos, virtutes acquirendas necnon vitam regularem addiscendam per constitutionum studium, pertinent; ut novitii ad christianam perfectionem per evangelicorum consiliorum ac votorum professionem, in quo praecise cuiusque religiosi finis consistit, tendere discant. Et iure merito novitiatus ultra annum praescribitur in aliquibus Institutis, ex eis praecipue quorum religiosi operibus exterioribus dant operam, quippe qui variis distracti curis, saeculi periculis magis obnoxii, solidiore atque firmiore spiritus fundamento egent. Quamobrem mandat haec Sacra Congregatio ut, etiam secundo novitiatus anno perdurante, ante omnia quaelibet munia disciplina spiritualis vitae apprime curetur.

II. Fas tamen esto, secundo novitiatus anno, novitio vel novitiae Instituti operibus vacare si id ferant constitutiones; verum prudenter et moderate id fiat, tantummodo ad novitiorum instructionem; nec unquam in iisdem operibus tyrones adeo occupentur, ut per se soli officia exercent (v. gr.: supplendo in scholis magistris aut quasi-magistris absentibus, vel in nosocomiis infirmis ministrando), sed operibus ipsis vacent sub directione et vigilantia gravis religiosi, vel religiosae, qui verbo doceat exemploque praecurrat.

III. Si quando a constitutionibus permittatur ut novitius vel novitia, secundo novitiatus anno, ad opera Instituti extra domum novitiatus mittatur, hoc nonnisi per modum exceptionis agatur et dummodo gravis adsit causa, quae id suadeat: haec autem causa ex parte novitii vel novitiae se habere debet, quatenus in domo novitiatus aut sufficienter institui nequeant, aut ibidem aliter permanere non valeant; numquam vero, sub quocumque praetextu, sufficiens esse causa possit necessitas aut utilitas religionis, si, exempli gratia, ex deficientia religiosorum novitii inoperibus Instituti illis substituerentur.

IV. Sive autem in domo novitiatus, sive extra, tyrones permanserint, duobus ante professionem mensibus ab omni opere externo abstineant, si extra novitiatum fuerint, ad illum revocentur, ut per integrum bimestre ad professionem emittendam, in spiritu suae vocationis firmati, se praeparent.

V. Ssñus Dominus Noster Benedictus Pp. XV in audientia habita a R. D. P. Ab. Secretario die 3 novembris 1921 tenorem huius instructionis approbavit eamque ab omnibus servari mandavit.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria Sacrae Congregationis de Religiosis die mense et anno ut supra.

TH. CARD. VALFRÉ DI BONZO, *Praefectus*.

MAURUS M. SERAFINI, Ab. O.S.B., *Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

FOUR NEW FEASTS, WITH PROPER OFFICES AND MASSES, ARE ADDED TO THE UNIVERSAL CALENDAR

(October 26, 1921)

[The Offices of these Feasts become obligatory in the year 1922, but the Ordinary (or Religious Superior, for his own subjects) may defer the obligation to the following year, if he deems it expedient.]

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

URBIS ET ORBIS

NONNULLA FESTA CUM OFFICIIS ET MISSIS PROPRIIS AD UNIVERSAM
ECCLESIAM EXTENDUNTUR

DECRETUM

Sanctissimus Dominus noster Benedictus Papa XV plurimorum Sacrorum Antistitum votis precibusque obsecundans, atque peculiaribus validisque rationibus permotus, ex Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis consulto, Festa prouti sequuntur, cum Officiis et Missis propriis et approbatis, ad universam Ecclesiam amodo extendi atque Calendario et Proprio Sanctorum Breviarii et Missalis Romani in futuris editionibus et respectivis locis inseri statuit ac decrevit :

I. Dominica infra Octavam Epiphaniae, Sanctae Familiae Iesu, Mariae, Ioseph, duplex maius (cum iisdem privilegiis ac iuribus praefatae Dominicae), Com. Dominicae et Octavae.

II. Die 24 martii, S. Gabrielis Archangeli, duplex maius.

III. Die 28 iunii, S. Irenaei Ep. et Mart., duplex, Com. Vigiliae, reposito Festo S. Leonis Papae et Conf. in diem natalem 3 iulii.

IV. Die 24 octobris, S. Raphaelis Archangeli, duplex maius.

Neminem latet, quantum sit aequum et salutare domesticae familiae ipsique societati consociationem Sanctae Familiae ab Apostolica Sede constitutam, legibus firmatam atque indulgentiis et privilegiis speciatim pro sodalibus et parochis honestatam, fovere ac propagare, et ad hunc etiam finem in universa Ecclesia peculiari ritu liturgico, atque iugi ac fructuosa beneficiorum meditatione et virtutum imitatione, Sanctam Familiam Nazarenam recolere ac celebrare.¹ Nec minus congruum est etiam ad incrementum pietatis, ipsiusque a Sancta Familia consociationis, divinam missionem utriusque Archangeli, nempe S. Gabrielis ad annuntiandum Dominicae Incarnationis mysterium, et S. Raphaelis cuius conlata in Tobiae familiam beneficia in Sacris Litteris describuntur, religiosa celebritate commemorare.

Hanc occasionem nacto Beatissimo Patri placuit etiam grato animo et liturgico more honorare illum S. Polycarpi Smyrnensis Episcopi discipulum, Lugdunensem Ep. et Mart. qui in suo opere *Adversus haereses* lib. III, magnificum testimonium in perpetuum memoriam de Romana Ecclesia reliquit, scribens : 'Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam propter poten-

¹ Cf. *Decr. auth. S.R.C.*, nn. 3777, 3778, 3802 (vol. iii.)

tiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est eos qui sunt undique fideles. . . . Hac (Romanorum Pontificum) ordinatione et successione ea quae est ab Apostolis in Ecclesia traditio et veritatis praeconatio pervenit usque ad nos.¹

Nec omittendum est quod ex authenticis constat documentis S. Eleutherium Romanum Pontificem a Lugdunensi Ecclesia per litteras de nonnullis quaestionibus consultum S. Irenaeo litterarum latori Apostolicas traditiones quas Romana Ecclesia servaverat illibatas, aperuisse.²

Itaque idem Sanctissimus Dominus noster omnia quatuor supradicta Festa, sub respectivo ritu, Officio et Missa, approbata et universae Ecclesiae Latini ritus concessa, ab utroque Clero saeculari et regulari aliisque omnibus qui ad divinum Officium recitandum ex praecepto adstringuntur, iussit peragenda inde ab anno 1922 proxime sequenti; facta tamen potestate Ordinariis locorum et Superioribus maioribus Ordinum seu Congregationum regularium, quatenus in Domino ipsi hoc expedire iudicaverint, huiusmodi obligationem pro suis subditis differendi in ulteriorem annum 1923. Servatis de cetero Rubricis atque Apostolicae Sedis Decretis, memorata Festa quoque modo respicientibus. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Die 26 octobris 1921.

✠ A. CARD VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,
S. R. C. Praefectus.
ALEXANDER VERDE, Secretarius.

L. ✠ S.

¹ I. P. Migne, *Cursus Patrologiae*, ser. graeca, vol. vii. col. 849, 851.

² Off. propr. Rom. (27 maii) Ss. Joannis I, Urbani I et Eleutherii Pp. et Mm., lect. vi.

REVIEWS AND NOTES

IRELAND : ELEMENTS OF HER EARLY STORY. By J. J. O'Kelly. Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.

It is admitted by educationists that the history of one's country claims a place to itself in any sane national scheme of education. This is not merely the opinion of theorists; it is a view which finds expression in the education programmes of all enlightened countries. The spirit of patriotism which gave Germany such power and cohesion, and secured for her such a leading position in so many departments of thought and activity, was undoubtedly due to the prominence given to the study of national history in German schools and colleges. The powers that have been in Ireland showed their appreciation of the fact in another way. Their aim being to destroy and not to foster national sentiment, they carefully concealed from the student the fact that his country had a history which had a peculiar claim on his consideration. Now that Irishmen are taking this matter of education—with other things—into their own hands, we may expect a radical change in the attitude of our schools towards this important subject. For this reason the appearance of the book under review is particularly opportune, and we regard it as of happy augury that it should come from the pen of Mr. J. J. O'Kelly, the Dail Minister of Education.

The period covered by this interesting volume extends from our earliest history to the coming of the Anglo-Normans. In the closing chapter we find a spirited discussion of the much-disputed Bull of Adrian IV, the authenticity of which our author accepts, though he does not fail to indicate some of the arguments of Cardinal Moran and others who champion the opposite view. The implications contained in this document as to the state of religion and morality in Ireland at the time give an opportunity to the writer to draw a striking contrast between Ireland and other European nations in these respects—greatly to the advantage of the former.

The arrangement adopted in dealing with the various matters which call for treatment is so admirable that it calls for a special word of praise. Instead of following the chronological order, the author divides his book into ten chapters, in each of which he discusses some special phase of Irish history or civilization. In each chapter we again find sub-titles under which the separate divisions of the subject are adequately treated. This arrangement has the advantage that no matter where one opens the book, he finds a complete account of some interesting fact or personage in our history. This makes the book peculiarly convenient for purpose of reference, as each subject is disposed of under

its appropriate heading, and the necessity for cross-reference is practically done away with.

This book is the fruit of many years' labour, and necessitated the study of a large number of books and manuscripts not easily accessible to the general reader. Indeed, the student or reader who would have at hand all the information contained in this one volume, would need to have a small library of somewhat costly books at his command. The book is literally packed with information, clearly and vividly presented, and its value to the student is greatly enhanced by the many excellent illustrations which supplement the text.

The history of one's native country should be something more than a record of facts, however interesting and however well narrated. It should be something vital, living, having continuity, growth, and succession, as living things have. Such is the history which Mr. O'Kelly gives us in his fascinating book. As we read it we feel we are a part of the story which it tells. We are conscious also that the story has yet to be continued, because the civilization of which it treats still continues to go on.

We hope soon to see an edition of this work for the use of schools. For this purpose it should be re-issued in separate parts, and at a suitable price. The present edition is for the home or the library. It is an excellent book, splendidly produced, and well worth the price which the publishers ask for it.

C. O'B.

ST. JOHN BERCHMANS. By Hippolyte Delehaye, S.J. New York : Benziger Brothers.

FATHER DELEHAYE is a well-known member of the 'Bollandists'—an association of scholars who edit the *Acta Sanctorum*. The first draft of this biography was, he tells us, made to beguile the dreary hours of his imprisonment in Brussels during the war. He has, fortunately, been persuaded to allow the sketch to be revised by a friend and given to the public.

The biography follows the usual lines, and details the main events of the Saint's career, from his birth in Brabant in 1599 till his death in Rome in 1621. If the Life were written by another pen one might be inclined to discount as overdrawn the picture of a mere boy so absolutely faultless; but when Father Delehaye vouches for the facts, one can only accept, and marvel at, the perfection of sanctity which the story of the life reveals. Boys love a hero. Father Delehaye depicts for them a hero worthy of their admiration, and, in a prudent way, of their imitation.

A MILL TOWN PASTOR : THE STORY OF A WITTY AND VALIANT PRIEST.
By Rev. Joseph P. Conroy, S.J. New York : Benziger Bros.

'HERE is a book with "jump" to it from the first line to the last.' 'You will want to read it through at a sitting, and you will come back to it again for its sheer delight.' So say the two typically American

notices on the cover paper. We 'jumped' to it, read it at a sitting, and re-read some portions of it. That speaks well for the book. Nevertheless, there remained a feeling of disappointment, due, we think, to the impression that the author is too intent on retailing stories, conversations and incidents, to show what Father Coffey was, and fails to bring into sufficient relief the work that Father Coffey did. Valuable space is occupied with letters from college that show no individuality and are of no public interest. Even the few letters of his pastoral days could be omitted without loss, and one—the letter on page 133—might be omitted with advantage for its sharp, querulous tone introduces a discordant element into the universal harmony. The chapter on the Oil Adventure might also be condensed, if not entirely eliminated, for it detracts from 'The Story of a Witty and Valiant Priest.' We can, however, assure our readers that, alleged flaws notwithstanding, they will enjoy Father Conroy's sketch of this genial Mill Town Pastor, whose native wit and charm won a ready entry into the hearts and pockets of Jew and Gentile in the polyglot town of Mingo.

YOUR OWN HEART, and LIFE'S LESSONS. By Father Garesché.
New York: Benziger Brothers.

THESE are two additional volumes from the pen of Father Garesché. In *Your Own Heart* the author deals chiefly with some of the ordinary virtues we should strive to practise in our private lives and in the little world wherein we move. *Life's Lessons* contains a series of useful instructions on a variety of subjects, such as 'A Vice of Good People,' 'Discouragement,' 'The Holy Angels,' 'Family Prayer,' etc. Two very short chapters towards the end urge the importance of supporting Catholic literature and Catholic art. Father Garesché's works are so well known and so popular that they need no special recommendation.

THE PATH OF HUMILITY. By the Author of *Spiritual Progress*, etc.
London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne.

THIS is a meditation book on the fundamental virtue of Humility. There is a preliminary survey of humility as a special virtue and its general influence on one's moral life. The subsequent series of meditations is divided into 'Five Weeks.' The 'First Week' is devoted to considerations on the necessity of Humility; the 'Second Week' to the reasons for being humble; the 'Third Week' to the example of Christ in His Hidden and Public Life; the 'Fourth Week' to True and False Humility; and the 'Fifth Week' to the transformation of self-esteem and the desire for praise into virtues which recognize the gifts of God in our own excellences.

The treatment of the subject is, as this brief synopsis shows, remarkably full, and the author has taken care to apply the considerations in at thoroughly practical way to the circumstances of every-day life. The numerous short sayings and examples from Scripture and from the

saints are admirably suited to impress the author's points on the attention of the reader. He who makes a proper use of this meditation book will soon acquire a humble insight into his own short-comings, and a humble knowledge of his entire dependence on God for all the good he has or does.

D.

JESUS CHRIST, THE KING OF HEARTS. By Very Rev. Alexis M. Lepicier, O.S.M. New York : Benziger Brothers.

FATHER LEPICIER is the Prior-General of the Order of Servites of Mary, and a Consultor of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation. Prefixed to this volume of his is a letter of Benedict XV, in which His Holiness thanks the author for a copy of the work and cordially praises it. The book had its origin in a series of sermons which Father Lepicier delivered on the Sacred Heart. 'In the hope of bringing many to realize what the Heart of Jesus is for each of us, the preacher re-arranged the sermons and divided them so as to form thirty chapters which might serve for spiritual reading or meditation in the month of June.'

If we might, without presumption, express an opinion on a work by such a distinguished author, we should say that it would perhaps have been better to have given us the sermons as they were first written. In a volume of sermons rhetorical periods and an abundance, or even superabundance, of adjectival padding, are more or less expected; but in a spiritual reading book or meditation book they are out of place. For example, take the description of Christ's entry into Jerusalem (p. 59): 'Riding not on a proudly caparisoned charger, but on a humble ass, and followed by His disciples and an immense multitude, Jesus triumphantly enters the Holy City, acclaimed by the joyful shouts of the populace.' St. Matthew's description of the event is much simpler in diction, and therefore more suitable for meditation. Or again, in reference to St. Paul's conversion (p. 112): 'No doubt an earthly king would have been able, with soldiers and weapons, to arrest, overthrow, and enchain a foe of this sort, and get rid of him by throwing him into prison or hanging him on a gallows. But no monarch, be he ever so powerful, could have succeeded in suddenly changing the man's heart so as to render him a docile subject, a faithful servant, an approved friend, ready to lay down his life, a thousand lives if he had them, for Him whom he had formerly hated to the death.' Or again, speaking of prayer (p. 204): 'To Him should be raised the grave voice of the father and the sweet tones of the mother, re-echoed by the silvery notes of the children, all praying God to bless the opening day or to drive away temptations and misfortunes from the sombre night.' The sermon-character of the reading is thus very apparent.

On p. 198 the translation of the quotation from St. Francis de Sales' Conference on Modesty may cause admiration: 'Bees are never at peace until they have found their *king*. . . . But as soon as their *king* is born, they all surround *him* and never leave *him* except for their harvest and by *his* command.'

The translation is indeed literally correct ; but as the statement is contrary to the now known facts of natural history, it would seem more appropriate to translate the *sense* of the original text. In the English version of the Conferences published sixty years ago, 'queen' is given as the translation.

The observations we have made do not touch the substance of the work. On that point, it will suffice to quote from the Pope's letter, in which His Holiness says that this book of Father Lepicier's is 'profound in ideas,' and persuasive by reason of 'the sweet odour of piety which it breathes forth.'

D.

BOOKS, ETC., RECEIVED

- America* : A Catholic Review (December).
The Ecclesiastical Review (December). U.S.A.
The Rosary Magazine (December). Somerset, Ohio.
The Catholic World (December). New York.
The Austral Light (November). Melbourne.
The Ave Maria (December). Notre Dame, Indiana.
The Catholic Bulletin (December). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Irish Monthly (December). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Month (December). London : Longmans.
Études (December). Paris : 12 Rue Oudinot (VII^e).
Revue Pratique d'Apologétique (December). Paris : Beauchesne.
The Fortnightly Review (December). St. Louis, Mo.
The Lamp (December). Garrison, N.Y.
Revue des Jeunes (December). Paris : 3 Rue de Luynes.
The Catholic Evidence Movement. By Rev. H. Browne, S.J. London : Burns, Oates & Washbourne.
The Art of Interesting. By Rev. F. P. Donnelly, S.J. London : Harding and Moore.
God's Wonder Book. By Marie St. S. Ellerker, O.S.D. London : Burns, Oates, and Washbourne.
The 'Summa Theologica.' Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. London : Burns, Oates & Washbourne.
Off and On. By Rev. M. O'Byrne. Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Church and Labour. By Rev. J. A. Ryan and Rev. J. Husslein, S.J. London : Harding and Moore.

BENEDICT XV

IT is with profound sorrow that we have to record the death of Our Holy Father Pope Benedict XV. In his election the guidance of the Holy Spirit was peculiarly manifested. Never in the whole history of the Papacy was a Pope presented with problems of such difficulty and magnitude as fell to the lot of Benedict. He entered upon a reign during which the world was rent by racial strife and hatred. In his own household national interests clashed. Yet it was in conditions just such as these that the superb vocation of the Papacy became most manifest, and, in the person of Benedict XV, it found a full expression. Never was the call to fulfilling our brotherhood in Jesus Christ more imperative, and never has the splendid unifying function of the Catholic Church proved itself more necessary to the welfare of mankind.

As the Vicar of Jesus Christ on Earth, as the successor of St. Peter, Benedict, realizing to the full his great responsibilities, displayed those high gifts of tact and diplomacy which were his natural inheritance. The rulers and

the diplomats of the world have borne, and are bearing, testimony to the greatness of these gifts and to the splendid use he made of them, but we, Catholics, know that the motive force behind this diplomatic energy was a burning zeal for a lasting peace based on a love of God, and a burning zeal for the propagation of the religion of Christ throughout the world.

To-day the nations mourn the loss of one whose sole interest was their welfare, but to no nation will Ireland yield precedence in the expression of heart-felt sorrow. Faithful as she has ever been to the See of Peter, she will treasure with deepest affection the memory of a Pope whose last act, almost, was to record his paternal joy at the dawn of her long-delayed freedom.

EDITOR.

ETERNAL LIFE

By THE BISHOP OF SEBASTOPOLIS

V

A few more years shall roll,
A few more Seasons come,
And we shall be with those who rest
Asleep within the tomb.

A few more struggles here,
A few more partings o'er,
A few more toils, a few more tears,
And we shall weep no more.

ALTHOUGH both Angels and Saints have often visited this earth, and appeared to men, yet we know but very little indeed of their celestial beauty. Even those favoured souls who have been granted such interviews, and who have actually held converse with their heavenly visitors, have never seen, and could never have seen, them *as they really are*. For no living person could possibly gaze upon a glorified soul, with his corporal eyes.

When the Archangel Gabriel appeared to Daniel, he did not and could not appear as an Angel, but took the form of 'a man clothed in linen, whose loins were girded with the finest gold' (Daniel x. 5). So, too, the Archangel Raphael, who accompanied the young Tobias on his journey, was seen as 'a beautiful *young man*, girded, and as it were ready to walk,' so that 'Tobias did not at first know that he was an angel from God' (Tobias v. 5, 6). In fact, no Angel has ever shown himself to man as he is seen by his companions in Heaven. The same statement must, of course, be made likewise of the Saints in Heaven, who have from time to time visited this world. As the Saints are pure spirits, and *as yet without any body*, they can no more appear, in their true glorified state, than can the Angels themselves, but must assume, for the time

being, some form that mortal man can bear to gaze upon, for no human being in his mortal state could bear the brightness and the beauty of a soul, in all its unveiled glory, and live. St. Bridget declares that if we were to see an Angel as he really is, we should die of sheer delight; and that if we were to see a devil as he really is, we should die of horror and terror.¹

It has often been asserted by mystical writers, that if God were to strengthen us, so that we could, without dying of wonder and admiration, behold, even the very least of His glorified Saints in all his celestial beauty and glory, our first impression would be that we were contemplating God Himself. And this seems probable enough. If a glorified soul were to appear to us, we should find ourselves gazing upon a beauty surpassing, by an immeasurable degree, every beauty hitherto known to us, and of a superior order. It would be a beauty so transcendent that we should not be able even to conceive a greater. Hence we would naturally exclaim within ourselves, 'Surely this must be the limit! I cannot believe anything more lovely or more exquisite can exist! Surely there can be nothing to surpass this! I must be gazing at God Himself.' In a word, before growing conscious of our mistake, we should require to be assured, on divine authority, that this beauty, so fascinating and so entrancing us, is infinitely less than the uncreated beauty of God. That, in sober truth, it is, after all, nothing more than the beauty of one of the least of His favoured servants.

If then such be the marvellous splendour and entrancing loveliness of event he very least in the Kingdom of Heaven, what must be the beauty of the greatest and the most exalted? And, what shall we say of the incalculable sum of beauty of all Saints and all Angels taken together, especially considering their inconceivable number, which defies all calculation. 'Count, if you can,' says the great Bossuet, 'the sands on the sea-shore, count if you can the stars in

¹ See Poulain, *Graces d'Oraison*, p. 314.

the firmament, and when you have done so, be firmly convinced that you have not reached the number of the Angels.' Speaking only of one section, namely, of those, whose duty it is to assist before the throne of God, Daniel, in inspired words, tells us that, 'Thousands upon thousands minister to Him, and ten hundred times a hundred thousand assist before His Throne.'

Yet, in spite of this, there can be no doubt but that it is not so much their prodigious number as their extraordinary variety, that will fill us with delight. Cardinal Newman compares the variety of beauty among the Saints of God's Church, to the variety of beauty observable among the flowers in a beautiful garden. Though his words refer to the Saints alone, yet they are perhaps even still more applicable to the Angels, if we accept St. Thomas' teaching, and may certainly be made to embrace both the one and the other. 'Each,' he says, 'has his own distinguishing grace, apart from the rest, and his own particular hue and fragrance and fashion, as a flower may have. As there are numerous flowers on the earth, all of them flowers, and so far, like each other; and all springing from the same earth, and nourished by the same air and dew, and none without beauty; and yet some are more beautiful than others; and of those which are beautiful, some excel in colour, and others in sweetness and others in form; and then again, those which are sweet have such perfect sweetness, yet so distinct, that we do not know how to compare them together, or to say which is the sweeter; so is it with souls filled and nurtured by God's secret grace.'¹ And so, let me add, is it likewise, only in a yet higher degree, with the countless angelic spirits, which fill the heavenly courts with their dazzling beauty.

But how, it may be asked, shall we ever be able to so much as make the acquaintance of such vast hosts of Angels and of Saints? It would be impossible, of course, were we to be left in our present helplessness, but God

¹ Newman's *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, p. 55.

will so strengthen our minds and so enlarge our faculties that we shall know each and every one with the utmost perfection. Even in this present life, God has sometimes given this extraordinary knowledge to some of his Saints, to their great delight. Thus, for instance, we are assured by St. Alphonse Rodriguez that being, on one occasion, transported, like another St. Paul, to Heaven, he not only saw all the inhabitants of that celestial region, but that he saw each one quite distinctly, and knew each individual as perfectly as if he had passed the whole of his life in his company.¹

If Saints on earth can receive such powers, and do such things, we may be quite sure that souls in Heaven will not be less favoured, but will be enriched with even greater powers, and do yet more wonderful things. Although the ravishing beauty and splendour of the innumerable Saints and Angels, our beloved companions and most devoted and intimate friends and associates, will add enormously to the happiness of our existence, in that thrice blessed Land, yet, even such overpowering happiness is quite secondary, and forms no part of the essential happiness of Heaven. The company of such choice spirits is to be reckoned only as one among what are called the 'accidental' joys; I say 'one,' because these accidental joys are many. Yet, although they are both innumerable and ineffable, they cannot, for a moment, bear any comparison to the joy arising from the clear contemplation and the complete possession of God Himself. And this is a point of such transcendently practical importance, that it will be well to offer a few remarks concerning it.

Though all well-instructed Catholics realize that God must, from the very nature of the case, be the one supreme and only infinite source of happiness, yet not one in a

¹ ' Dans les visions il peut y avoir beaucoup de connaissances simultanées. St. Alphonse Rodriguez raconte qu'étant transporté au ciel, il vit et connut tous les bienheureux ensemble, et chacun d'eux distinctement, comme s'il eût passé toute sa vie avec eux. . . . On raconte que St. Brigitte voyait souvent, en un seul instant, tous les habitants du ciel, de la terre et de l'enfer, et ce qu'ils se disaient les uns aux autres.' See Poulain's *Graces d'Oraison*, p. 326.

hundred at all understands the close and personal union that takes place in Heaven, between the vast Creator and His poor insignificant little creatures, i.e., between God and the soul, though this constitutes the very essence and marrow of the whole situation.

They know that God is essentially One and Indivisible, and infinitely greater than even the sublimest of His creatures. But, as a direct consequence of this knowledge, they persuade themselves that no individual can ever approach very near to Him. They fancy that they, and all the rest of the Blessed, will contemplate Him merely from afar, and that although their celestial happiness, of course, consists in gazing upon His beauty and perfections, it will be in gazing at them *from a respectful distance*. They seem to picture themselves as seated upon their heavenly thrones (as they might be seated in the stalls of a theatre), to look upon some entrancing scene; or as men on earth might gaze upon some newly discovered star. To be allowed even such a distant and partial view of God's infinite beauty, were it all we had to look forward to, might be a signal favour, but it is nothing to the glorious reality.

What 'the man in the street' forgets is that, although God is truly one and indivisible, yet that this self-same One and Indivisible God may be, and indeed is equally present, wholly and entirely, in every point of space, and what is more, that He gives Himself wholly and entirely to each individual soul in Heaven, just as though that individual were the only soul in existence. Each of the Blessed possess Him as completely as if He were present to no other. God actually unites Himself, in an ineffable manner, to each of the saved. Wonderful to say, each actually shares in the life of God; feels, as it were, His breath; thrills beneath His touch; and pours forth praises, adorations, and thanksgivings into His ear, as some perfect instrument distils sweet music, in the hands of a skilled musician. No words can, in truth, describe the intimacy and the closeness of the union between God

and His sweet spouse, the purified and glorified soul, or even suggest the raptures and the transports of His eternal embrace.

Even though this statement may strike us as marvellous and as almost too good to be true, yet the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist ought to be enough to prepare our minds to accept it, and to pave the way for a hearty and most grateful act of faith.

In Holy Communion, each one of the many millions of communicants receives into his soul, not only the entire Body and Blood and human soul of Jesus Christ, but His Divinity also; and (by *circumincessio*) the three divine Persons of the adorable Trinity, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost likewise. For, by reason of their identity with the one indivisible Substance and of Their essential relations to each other, none of Them can be conceived without or separate from the other Two.¹ So that, whether I am alone, or whether I am but one of many thousands, I receive absolutely the same. As St. Thomas sings: 'Sumunt unus, sumunt mille; quantum isti, tantum ille'; the number makes no difference. If then such are our privileges here, during our exile on earth, what will they not be in our Father's Home in Heaven? Although hidden from our view, yet even *in this world*, God condescends to come to us, in all His glory and majesty, and to dwell in the centre of our soul, whenever we approach the Altar rails. So intimate is that bond that we may then truthfully exclaim: 'I live now, not I, but Christ liveth in me' (Gal. ii. 20). This being the case, we may surely well ask: will God treat us with less familiarity and condescension when our period of trial and probation is over and our salvation is secured? Assuredly not! That which He does for us now, while we are *in via*, is but an earnest of immeasurably greater favours, to be heaped upon us when we are *in Patria*, i.e., safe in our Father's Home. In Heaven, He will give Himself to each one of us, we cannot

¹ See Wilhem and Scannell, *Manual of Theology*, vol. i. p. 264.

say in a *truer* way than upon earth, but in a far more sensible and manifest way, so that we shall be able fully to appreciate and to relish all the undreamed of sweetness and fragrance of His presence. In Holy Communion, our eyes are holden, our senses shut up, and our mind is left in darkness, illuminated solely by the obscure glimmer of Faith. In Heaven, our eyes shall be wide open, and our soul will actually gaze upon and realize the infinite beauty and divine perfections of Him, who holds us in His eternal and all-embracing love. No exercise of Faith will be any longer needed, for then Faith will have been changed into the clearest vision, so that the presence of God in the soul will be felt and enjoyed and understood, as it never can be on earth. For, as the Saints have expressed it, 'we shall be immersed and penetrated and filled by the divine immensity, as a sponge in the ocean is saturated and filled by its brimming waters.'

God will act in us, and through us, and with us. He will impart to us a share in His own divine attributes, and will flood our whole being with His own perfections, very much as the fierce flame, in a blazing furnace, will fill and flood with its own bright light and heat, the iron bar that is cast into its transforming flames. Such, at all events, is one of the commonest illustrations, with which spiritual writers have sought to interpret St. Peter's bold words: that we are to be made 'Partakers of the divine nature' (2 Peter i. 4).

Speaking of the happiness of the Saints in glory, Bishop G. Bautista de Lanuza, O.P., writes: 'God will give Himself wholly to the soul, with all His substance, omnipotence, glory, majesty, eternity, wisdom, wealth, etc., in such a way that nothing will belong to God that does not belong to the soul. (These will form the real riches of the soul), for the soul will possess these divine gifts, in a far truer and more intimate way, than the rich and noble of this world may be said to 'possess' the gold and silver and all the earthly treasures that they boast of, and claim as their own. In short, just as the soul,

united to the body, communicates to it life and vigour and motion, so, but in a much more ineffable manner, God united to the soul will communicate to it His divine attributes and infinite perfections. 'Ut impleamini in omnem plenitudinem Dei.'

As these startling words may astonish some of my readers, who may think that I am exaggerating, I append the Bishop's sentences just as they are, in the original Spanish.¹ What Lessius teaches is very similar, though expressed in different words.²

Before ascending to His heavenly Father, our Divine Lord made known to His disciples that He was going to prepare for them a celestial banquet in Heaven, where they would not only enjoy His company, but where they would even 'sit at His table, and eat and drink with Him.' Under this familiar figure, He taught them that they would share in His own delights, derive happiness from the same source, and be nourished by the same spiritual food, or as St. Thomas expresses it, 'Super mensam Dei manducant et bibunt, quia eadem felicitate fruunter qua Deus felix est, videntes eum illo modo quo ipse videt seipsum.'³ Our thoughts recur to this promise, when we contemplate the Angel 'standing in the sun,' spoken of by St. John, in the Apocalypse, 'who cried with a loud voice, Come and gather

¹ 'Todo Dios se dará al alma con toda su sustancia, omnipotencia, gloria, magestad, eternidad, sabiduría, riqueza; de manera, que nada tendrá Dios que no sea del alma; y tan suyo, que lo poseerá en sí misma, y lo encerrará dentro de sí; mas suyo sin comparacion que el oro y la plata, las heredades y posesiones de la tierra, y aun los propios vestidos que no pueden entra en el corazon, ni encerrarse en él. A la manera que el alma está dentro del cuerpo comunicándole el sér, la vida y el movimiento, así de un modo mas inefable estará Dios en el alma comunicándola su divino sér y sus perfecciones infinitas; Ut impleamini in omnem plenitudinem Dei' (iii. 19).—Lanuza, tom. vi. 73.

² 'Ad divinam pulchritudinem et speciem, quae prorsus inaeestimabilis et infinita est, proxime accedit pulchritudo animae beatae, quae Deo adeo est similis, ut nulla major cum Deo similitudo vel animo concipi, vel etiam per potentiam Dei absolutam (ut valde probabile est) dari possit; ut merito dictum sit a St. Joanne; cum apparuerit, similis ei erimus, quoniam videbimus eum sicuti est. Ratio est, quia in statu beatitudinis erit suprema participatio divinarum perfectionum; imo ipsa beatitudo in tali communicatione consistit.'—L. Lessius, l. ii. chap. xvi. p. 278.

³ *Contra Gent.*, i. iii. cap. li.

yourselves together to the great supper of God' (xix. 17). At that heavenly banquet, we shall feast on, and be, as it were, filled and inebriated with the divinity. For there we shall see God, and be with God, and shall live by God. As St. Bernard writes: '*Praemium nostrum est videre Deum, esse cum Deo, vivere de Deo.*' There, in a word, will be consummated and made perfect and perpetual, the holy union, now only begun, between the soul and God. A union so close and so ineffable as to fill the soul with ecstasy for all eternity. There, the heavenly Bridegroom will invite His chosen spouse to eat and drink of the celestial food, and to share in all the supernatural festivities and pleasures suggested by a superb and unexampled celestial Marriage Feast.

The beatitude of the next life may be likened to some priceless elixir, but with this difference, that the elixir is stored in tiny vases, and is so soon exhausted, that it has to be carefully dealt out in carefully measured drops, whereas the beatitude of Heaven is poured forth, without measure or limit, and flows, not like a quiet steady stream, but as a veritable 'torrent'; as it were rushing and tumultuous and overflowing its banks through the very abundance and copiousness of its volume. Men will not only 'drink' but they will be, as the inspired writer expresses it, inebriated and intoxicated with the intensity of their pleasure. '*Inebriabuntur ab ubertate domus Tuae, et torrente voluptatis Tuae potabis eos*' (Psalm. xxxv. 9).

'As a draught diffuses itself through all the members and veins of the body, so this communication of God diffuses itself substantially in the whole soul, or rather the soul is transformed in God. In this transformation the soul drinks of God in its very substance and its spiritual powers. In the intellect it drinks wisdom and knowledge, in the will the sweetest love, in the memory refreshment and delight, in the thought and sense glory unspeakable. That the soul receives and drinks delight in its very substance, appears from the words of the Bride in the Canticle: "My soul melted, when He spoke,"

that is when the Bridegroom communicated Himself to the soul.'¹ 'This divine draught deifies the soul, and elevates and inebriates it in God.'²

Theologians distinguish between two sorts of 'Participation in the divine nature.' The first confers upon the soul a certain resemblance to God, so that this participation is brought about *per quamdam similitudinis participationem*; the second consists in an intimate union between the soul and God. The two sorts of participation are mentioned and treated as united, by St. Dionysius, when he writes: 'Est autem haec deificatio ad Deum, quanta fieri potest, (1) assimilatio et (2) unio.' No one can sound the depths of this sublime mystery or conceive the closeness of such a union. Nothing in this world can be cited as a really adequate illustration. The example or illustration actually inspired by the Holy Ghost Himself, in more than one place, in the pages of Holy Scripture, is that of marriage. For marriage is the very closest union recognized by us, mortals, on earth; though it must be confessed that even marriage falls immeasurably short of being a really adequate figure. The spiritual, or what is more commonly called the mystical, marriage is a union between God and the soul, close, intimate, profound, and eternal, and immeasurably surpassing, in every respect, that which exists between husband and wife; for, the operations of Nature can never offer us anything better than the faintest shadow of the sublime operations of Grace. In the one case, the union is but a corporal one, in the other it is wholly spiritual. In the one case it involves but a material contact, in the other the whole soul is permeated and penetrated and taken possession of by God.³ Hence, while

¹ St. John of the Cross, vol. ii. 140.

² Ibid. 141.

³ 'Union pleine de douceur et de suavité. Comparée à cette union sainte, l'union matrimoniale n'est que froideur et amertume. Ici, le contentement est court, le plaisir bas et grossier; là, tout est grand, élevé, durable; c'est la gloire, c'est la pureté, c'est la tendresse, ce sont d'ineffables délices que la langue humaine est incapable d'exprimer, et le cœur de l'homme trop étroit pour les contenir.'—*De L'Habitation du Saint-Esprit*, p. 297, R. P. Froget.

the Apostle, in inspired words, describes the spouses of an earthly marriage, as '*Two in one flesh*, the same Apostle describes the spiritual marriage of the soul and God, as **TWO IN ONE SPIRIT**,' saying : '*Qui adhaeret Domino, unus spiritus efficitur*' (1 Cor. vi. 17).

In this connexion, it may be well to recall the words of St. John of the Cross, who reminds us of the prayer which Our Divine Lord addressed to His heavenly Father for His followers, asking 'that they may be one, as Thou Father in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us. . . . And the glory which Thou hast given Me, I have given to them; that they may be one as We also are one.' He then goes on to warn us that 'we are not to suppose from this that Our Lord prayed that the Saints might become one in essence and natural unity, as the Father and the Son are; but that they might become one in the union of love, as the Father and the Son are one in the oneness of their love. Thus souls have this great blessing *by participation* which the Son has *by nature*, and are therefore *really gods by participation, like unto God, and of His nature.*'¹

It seems strange, and at first sight almost incredible, that God should love so intensely a poor imperfect human creature, and that He should treat it with so much real affection. St. John of the Cross seems to explain this difficulty in some measure, by reminding us that God first clothes the soul with His own beauty and so loves Himself as He contemplates His image in the soul, and becomes enamoured of all His own divine perfections, which are mirrored there, as in a glass. Further, the glorified soul, on its side, being made by grace a most speaking image of God, will see its own image and its own beauty in God, and will greatly rejoice to behold there the eternal and infinite reality, of which it itself is but the created and finite and unworthy expression or reflection. In the following words of St. John of the Cross, I think we

¹ Vol. ii. 204-5.

may gather this meaning, although the language is a little involved and difficult to follow. Describing the soul, about to enter into Heaven, he represents it as addressing God in the following manner: “I shall see Thee in Thy beauty, and myself in Thy beauty, and Thou shalt see me in Thy beauty; and I shall see myself in Thee in Thy beauty, and Thou Thyself in me in Thy beauty; so *shall I seem to be Thyself* in Thy beauty and Thou myself in Thy beauty. My beauty shalt be Thine, Thine shall be mine, and I shall be Thou in it, and Thou myself in Thine own beauty; for *Thy beauty will be my beauty*, and so we shall see, each the other, in Thy beauty.” This is the adoption of the sons of God, who may truly say what the Son Himself says to the Eternal Father: All My things are Thine, and Thine are Mine (John xvii. 10). He by essence, being the Son of God by nature, we, by participation, being sons by adoption.’¹

St. John writes in the third chapter of his 1st Epistle: ‘*We know that when He shall appear, we shall be like to Him; because we shall see Him as He is.*’ Now, commenting upon this passage, the late Bishop Hedley, O.S.B., observes: ‘The words “*when He shall appear,*” signify the judgment and the entrance into Heaven; to “*see Him as He is*” expresses the Beatific Vision; and the phrase “*we shall be like to Him*” is the Apostle’s announcement that before we can see God, He must have taken possession of our whole being; His glory must have transfigured our being; and we must have been so gifted that it may be as it were *God Himself who looks upon Himself.*’²

Thus it is made clear that the transcendent joy, which floods the entire soul in Heaven, is no other than the joy of God Himself. ‘Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.’ The joy which constitutes the bliss of God, and by which He is essentially and eternally happy, is the very same joy which He communicates to us in Heaven, when He shows us His infinite beauty. ‘I am thy reward exceeding great’ (Gen. xv. 1); ‘I am thy salvation’ (Ps. xxxiv. 3).

¹ Vol. ii. p. 187.

² Vide Bishop Hedley’s *Retreat*, 402.

God is a being infinitely great, infinite in all possible perfections. And the enjoyment of His infinite beauty, which is manifested in all His divine perfections, is so exquisitely delightful, as to render God Himself completely and infinitely happy for all eternity. Yet, wonderful to relate, this infinite happiness, this exquisite delight which God possesses in Himself is precisely that which He communicates to us in His heavenly kingdom, to the full extent of our finite capacity. He will not say simply, 'Enter into joy,' but to show the exalted character of that joy, He says: 'Enter into the joy of thy Lord'—into that joy which God Himself possesses and which is such as to render even that Infinite Being infinitely happy. As a consequence, the joy of the Blessed from the Beatific Vision of the divine beauty must be wholly unutterable, and all the delights of this world, by comparison, nothing but bitterness, gall and wormwood. So incomprehensible is their joy, that thousands of years pass away like a day, and each day gives them the joy of thousands of years. 'Be not ignorant, my beloved,' says St. Peter, 'that one day with the Lord is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day' (2 Peter iii. 8). Holy David also assures us that 'a thousand years in the sight of God are but as yesterday, which is passed and gone' (Ps. lxxxiii. 11). Wonderful statements, which help us to form some idea of the amazing delight which must flow from the contemplation of God.¹

Another characteristic of heavenly joy, which distinguishes it from all earthly joys of every description, is the fact that it never wearies nor grows stale. Although every power and faculty of the soul shall be perfectly filled and satisfied with it, and although man's whole being shall be satiated with the most indescribable delights, and although this shall continue, without a moment's interruption, for the whole of an exhaustless eternity, yet the soul will never grow in the least weary of it—never tire of it, or seek any change; will never loathe it, or be cloyed with

¹ Vide Dr. Hay's *Devout Christian*, p. 116.

it. Quite the contrary, she will discover in the divine beauty an inexhaustible fountain of perfections, of wonders, of truths, of graces, and will be so totally overwhelmed with the ineffable joy she experiences in beholding it, that for all eternity she will never be able to turn her thoughts, no, not for a single moment, from contemplating the entrancingly lovely object which causes it. And, what is more, her delight will continue to be as full, as entire, as intense, and as inconceivably great throughout all eternity, as it was the first moment she entered into possession of it.

What a contrast this offers us to the wretched pleasures of this world, the very highest and best of which cannot be enjoyed but for a short time, without engendering the most unmistakable disgust and loathing.

The contemplation of Heaven, and of the wonders which God has prepared for those who love Him, is calculated to impress the mind of the believer very deeply. Perhaps the first impression will be one of wonder and admiration at the inconceivable grandeur and wholly unimaginable range and magnificence of that life of union with God. The second will be one of gratitude and thankfulness to God, whose condescension, generosity, and love is thereby so abundantly manifested. It will come to us as a fresh proof of the marvellous tenderness, compassion, and infinite goodness of our heavenly Father, and our hearts will burn with love for One who is prepared to treat us with such infinite honour and distinction, affection and familiarity.

But the most deeply marked impression, I take it, will be one of almost incredible astonishment that such and so unique a future should actually be within our reach. It almost makes one stagger, and takes one's breath away, to think, and not only to think, but to *know with all the certainty of faith*, that such a future is actually offered to us; and on the easiest conditions; and that we shall really and truly secure it, if only we lead ordinary good lives. The contrast between that celestial life and the present life is so immense, its occupations, its surroundings, its

society and environment, so totally unlike anything to which we have been accustomed, that we can hardly bring ourselves to realize that we can ever be so far exalted above our present lowly state, as to become courtiers of the King of kings, and Lord of lords, yea, the loved and spoiled children of the infinite Being who created us, and whose love is the richest and the highest of all possessions. 'To Whom be benediction, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, honour, power, and strength, for ever and ever' (Apocalypse vii. 12).

✠ JOHN S. VAUGHAN.

[To be continued.]

THE CANONS-REGULAR OF PRÉMONTRÉ, 1120-1920

BY REV. PHILIP HUGHES

ONE of the things least comprehended by the average non-Catholic, and whose revelation generally leaves him bewildered, is the interior life of Catholics distinguished by their social and public activities. This astonishment was very conspicuous in the reviews and notices of Mr. Snead-Cox's *Life of Cardinal Vaughan*, when that notable book first appeared. The revelation of the Cardinal's continual striving after union with Christ in every act of life, and of the continual self-searchings and habitual mortification by which he fostered and cherished this life of the spirit, left his numerous critics dumb. They had known the energetic founder of a great missionary society, who tramped America for years to found the College at Mill Hill; the Bishop of Salford, who had given his diocese a seminary, a college, and flourishing societies for rescue work; the Cardinal-Archbishop, who, in a materialistic age, had built a cathedral worthy to stand beside those of the ages of faith. They had known and had fought the valiant defender of Catholic Truth, who struck unflinchingly wherever he saw his opportunity. But that beneath all this energy lay the life of mortification and prayer, that all his power and courage came from the hours spent before the crucifix, or in his chapel, and that under his scarlet sleeves he wore for years the bracelet studded with spikes—this was, to most of them, a phenomenon as far beyond understanding as out of expectation.

Yet it is one of the most ordinary phenomena of the spiritual life, the commonest and most essential features

of the lives of all the saints, a phenomena which to some degree must find place in the lives of all the Church's ministers, and one which, in some measure, she demands, shall characterize each one of them. To keep alive in her missionary clergy this interior flame, threatened continually with extinction by their many inevitable and necessary temporal activities, has ever been one of her problems, for lacking that fire, the most elaborate organization, the most exalted enthusiasm, the most generous industry came to naught. Faced in every age with such a problem, her history records a series of solutions, differing in method with the centuries that produced them, alike in this their end. One of these solutions, a medieval solution, the solution of a saint, has for the moment a special interest, for the institute which embodies it celebrated lately the eighth centenary of its founding. That institute is the Order of Canons-Regular of Prémontré.

The Order was founded in the year 1120 by a priest of Lower Lorraine, Norbert of Gennepe. He had been a member of the wealthy collegiate chapter of Xanten, his native town, and after a worldly life at the court of his kinsman the Emperor Henry V, was, at the age of thirty-five, miraculously converted. He determined to become the apostle of Him Whom he had so long neglected, and after fruitless endeavours to reform his lax brethren of Xanten, passed into the modern country of Belgium and Northern France, preaching from village to village and in the various towns much as did the Franciscans and Dominicans a century later. His learning, eloquence, and sanctity of life wrought wonders wherever he passed, and the one-time courtier seemed, in the life of a wandering apostle, to have found his true vocation. Nothing could have been farther from his mind than the founding of an Order. The turning-point in his apostolic career was the intervention of the Bishop of Laon, in whose diocese he was preaching, and of the Pope, Calixtus II. Whether they feared that so austere a life would too soon rob the world of a powerful force for good, or whether they thought it a pity that such a saint

should pass without the permanent testament of a school of disciples, together they brought pressure on him to end, if only for a time, his missionary tours. He was to remain in the diocese of Laon, and to that end the Bishop nominated him provost of the chapter of St. Martin in the episcopal city. But, as the Saint had foreseen, the canons were not ready to accept his schemes of reform, and he soon resigned his charge. As the Bishop still desired him to remain near Laon, guided miraculously, he settled with a few companions in the desolate valley of Prémontré. The Order of Prémontré was a fact.

The time was singularly promising for the new institute ; it was a time of revival of Christian life throughout Europe. The anarchy in which the feudal disorganization of the two centuries that followed the death of Charlemagne threatened to drown the Church had gradually given way. The reform party in the Church—its inspiration, St. Gregory VII—if it had not restored her original purity, had given her development a truer direction, and furnished her with means to pursue it—a clear conscience and true principles. Clerical marriage was henceforth an impossibility. Simony, with the disappearance of lay investiture, immensely less frequent, and if worldly prelates still remained, their lives, by comparison with those of generations of their predecessors were, one might almost say, exemplary. A spirit of reform was abroad, and with it a general revival of faith and piety. It was the age of the first Crusades, of the Cistercians and St. Bernard, the age of the first Gothic cathedrals and of the first schoolmen, it was, in short, the Spring that made possible the Summer of the thirteenth century, and if the fervent heart of St. Bernard is the promise of St. Francis, if St. Anselm foreshadows St. Thomas Aquinas, it is none the less true that in St. Norbert, we have the precursor of the preacher St. Dominic.

St. Norbert had been a canon, that is to say one of a community of priests living a common life, and with the charge of a parish, being bound to the recitation each day in common of the Divine Office. Such a life was not the

life of a monk—it was not contemplative, and lacked the austerities of a monastic rule, and if the Divine Office formed an essential part of St. Norbert's scheme, it was not his intention to found an Order of monks. One might, indeed, say that it was not his intention to found an Order at all. Rather it was in the reform of an already existing institute that he sought his means of apostolate—in an Order of Canons, their rule that of St. Augustine, with some additions of his own.

That priests engaged in the ministry should live a common life under the discipline of a rule, should live, that is to say, the canonical life, was no new idea at the time of St. Norbert. It had been realized centuries before by St. Eusebius of Vercelli, and, a little later, by forming on a like system his own household, St. Augustine consecrated it for all time. In Carolingian times the restoration of the canonical life by Chrodegang of Metz was one of the chief sources of the revival of ecclesiastical discipline. There followed two centuries of incredible disorder, but, it is interesting to note, once the reform in the Church commenced, the Popes, who began the fight for a higher standard of priestly life, turned immediately to the canonical life as to their most powerful arm. The famous Roman Council of 1059 imposed it on all. 'The clerks who promised my predecessor to live chastely ought to live, eat, and sleep in common, in the churches to which they are attached: they should live a common life.' There follows a revision and promulgation of the legislation of 815 on the subject.

A revival of the canonical life had then been in progress for some years, when Norbert of Xanten, the one-time canon, the unsuccessful reformer of several chapters, took up his abode at Prémontré. The episcopate had been reformed in the seventy years since Sutri by the rejuvenated Papacy; Cîteaux had restored the fading ideals of monasticism; Prémontré was to fashion for the apostolate of souls a clergy that would in truth be an élite. Thence were to go out missionaries and pastors of souls, of disciplined lives and tried virtue, introducing among the decadent

clergy of the day the reform that had just been achieved in the ranks of the Hierarchy. That the means chosen to accomplish the reform was an institute of canons, was very natural. Not only was it in accordance with all the tendencies of the Church at that time, but St. Norbert had himself been a canon, and so, too, had many of his first companions. Yet, since he knew the weaknesses of the life, he was not content to take it as it stood. To guard against its chief abuses, the canons of his institute were to have a rule approaching very nearly that of the monastic Orders. In the first place community of goods, complete detachment from the things of this world secured by the vow of poverty. Against more domestic dangers security was sought by the practice of austerities hitherto unknown in the life of a chapter. Fasts, at first perpetual ; abstinence from meat, manual work, the silence, strict observance of the cloister, the daily chapter, the midnight vigils of the Divine Office ; all these were, in the intention of the founder, but the necessary safeguards of the virtue of an apostle. Except for the end which directed it, the life was but little different from that of the contemporary foundation of Citeaux.

What that end was we need not again repeat. It must, however, be noted that though soon the Premonstratensian became a parish-priest, it is at least doubtful if such was St. Norbert's first ideal. His own life, from the establishment of Prémontré in 1120 to his consecration as Archbishop of Magdebourg six years later, is still, in the main, that of a missionary preacher—six years of missionary tours through the various towns and villages of Brabant, Germany, and Northern France, tours varied only by occasional periods of retreat at Prémontré. Moreover, we have the witness of his biographer that he was averse to the foundation of his abbeys in the neighbourhood of towns. Nevertheless he himself, in several instances—notably Antwerp—ceded to the urgency of ecclesiastical authority, and once, as Archbishop, faced with the problem of providing a reformed clergy for his flock, he did not hesitate to install the Premonstratensians in the various parishes of the episcopal

city, and also in those of the country districts. His ideal may have been the service of parishes by chapters of his canons, but from the beginning we find them installed as parish priests in isolated parishes, replacing the secular clergy. The other branch of the ministry—the itinerant preaching—declined in its turn, and for the greater part of their history the abbeys of the Order filled the rôle of the modern seminary—the formation of a good parish clergy. To each abbey were attached a number of churches served, not by chapters, but by single priests recruited from amongst the canons of the abbey. The value of such an institute to the medieval Church, in the days before seminaries were known, can only be realized by a study of the extraordinary development of the Order. Exact figures are, naturally enough, difficult to obtain, but there is sufficient data to form an approximate idea.

In the first thirty years of its existence the Order had established itself in every country of Christendom, the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem included, and by the death of its second general, Blessed Hugh of Fosses, it numbered 120 abbeys. That it ever possessed the myriad abbeys claimed by some of its chroniclers may be doubted, but the figures of sober historians like Hugo and Le Paige warrant us in asserting that the expansion of the Order in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was one of the most remarkable phenomena of the Church's history. As in the fourth and fifth centuries the current of piety swept whole multitudes into the solitudes of the desert, so, seven hundred years later, the same force, changing its direction, filled with the faithful of both sexes a thousand Premonstratensian abbeys.

It is but natural to ask how it came about that, from the first days even of the Order, the ideals which had inspired its foundation were destined hardly ever to be realized—in the way, at least their founder had planned—and how the abbey came to play a rôle in the life of the Church quite different from that conceived by St. Norbert. The explanation does not appear difficult. The Saint had barely time to supervise the first few years of his Order's

life when he was consecrated Archbishop of Magdebourg. Until then his personality had sufficed to unite his numerous disciples, and their master thus suddenly called away, all that remained to them was the rule of St. Augustine and the tradition of what St. Norbert had desired. That rule—basis of the Order though it was—is yet sufficiently vague, that even to-day it serves as a rule for widely-differing institutes. Hence, left to itself, without constitutions, the Order seemed threatened with dissolution. The differences which, even in the time of St. Norbert's rule, had manifested themselves, appeared once more—this time, it seemed, to remain. The law which ended these divisions and introduced a uniform discipline was the work of Norbert's successor, the Blessed Hugh of Fosses, and his colleagues, the various abbots. It was a practical compromise, in which the original ideals suffered considerable modifications; modifications due, no doubt, to the experience of those few years. Thus, for example, in these first statutes of the Order, we find no special prescription regarding preaching—a fact which is simply astonishing, when one recalls the life of St. Norbert and his first companions. And these statutes date from the first twenty years of the Order; nay, were probably composed during the lifetime of the Saint. In the ideal of parish administration, too, we note a departure. In St. Norbert's mind there had been no intention of a foundation with two classes of priests—some living in the abbey the canonical life, others, their studies and formation completed, going out to serve distant parishes. Yet this is what soon came to pass, and the Premonstratensian Canon lived in his parish, alone, as did the secular priest, save for the continual relations with his brethren in the abbey—always an encouragement and assistance.

To complete our account we must indicate one or two other features of the Order which give to its foundation a special interest.

It was primarily an Order of priests, and in this it was a novelty. To be a monk, the priesthood, the clerical state even, had not been necessary, but for the apostle, the canon

with the cure of souls, the priesthood was essential. On the other hand, for those who wished to associate themselves with the work of the abbey, and who yet had no desire for the priesthood or not sufficient abilities, a place was provided by the lay-brothers—‘*monachi*,’ as the ancient writers term them in contradistinction to the ‘*canonici*.’ Their life was in fact that of the great mass of the monks of the time.

Manual work was an important feature of the life at Prémontré, where the first canons built with their own hands their church. But the intervention of the Bishop of Laon influenced St. Norbert to modify this practice, and, though the manual work long remained as an exercise of humility, later on the pressure of more urgent duties brought about its discontinuance.

Finally, the apostolic man must have at least a little learning, and so, contrary to the practice at Cîteaux, learning was, from the first days of the Order, held in honour by the Premonstratensians. When the postulant presented himself there, his knowledge was tested as well as his piety, and from the beginning there were in the abbeys regular courses of study. Here, too, we may discern the influence of St. Norbert and his first associates, all of them alumni of the colleges attached to some cathedral or collegiate church, several of them of the famous school of Laon. Its estimation for learning and the need for competent professors in the abbey schools led the Order to take early advantage of the Universities when they came into being, and establish at Paris in 1252 the Collège des Prémontrés, and in Louvain, across the street from where this is written, the Collegium Canonicum Præmonstratensium.

To sum up in the words of a modern Premonstratensian, Mgr. Hugh Lamy, Abbot of Tongerlo : ‘Comprising at the same time every form of clerical activity, and all the austerities of monasticism, the Order is in touch with all the institutions of its day, is in fact nothing less than a link between those of the past and of the future. . . . Canon, parish priest, monk, penitent, each and all of these was the Norbertine to be, if he would realize the expectation of his founder. It was

by the realization of this programme that the austere convert of Xanten sought to labour for the reform of the Church.'

Of the history of the Order in the long centuries since its beginnings, we do not propose to say much. Rather we are concerned to note the ideal of its founder, the work of the Order to-day, and to consider finally what prospects the future offers to its genius. That the marvellous fervour of the first canons suffered as the years passed is in no way surprising; it is the lot of all institutions, and the general decadence of the Church at certain epochs is reflected in every phase of her life. Such an epoch was the fifteenth century, and the numerous and, by this time, wealthy abbeys shared in the general evils of the time. Discipline was relaxed, the bands that bound the Order together—the General Chapter notably—slackened, and the growing nationalism of the age found an echo in the tendencies of several provinces, England amongst others, towards a separate existence. Hungary, the most flourishing of all the provinces, suffered greatly from the Turkish invasions. Bohemia, which possessed, some thirty-four abbeys, was ravaged by the Hussite wars, and finally the Reformation lost to the Order the majority of its houses. England, Germany, and the Scandinavian countries saw destroyed in a few years hundreds of the Norbertine abbeys and sees. Compensating for these material losses, the General Chapter of 1630, under Tridentine influences, inaugurated a period of reform, and for another century and a half the Order, in the province left to it, flourished as in its first days. All this was, in a short ten years, utterly destroyed by the French Revolution. The abbeys of France and Belgium—more than a hundred in number—were dissolved, their demesnes confiscated, the religious driven out, and a century ago there were left but twenty-seven houses: nine in Austria, three in Russia, and fifteen in Spain. The Spanish houses were broken up in the civil wars in 1833, those of Russian Poland were lost some time afterwards, and the Order seemed near its end. It was, indeed, the darkest hour. But once again the impossible

happened, and there dawned upon the institute the day of yet another renaissance—more wonderful than that after 1630, in that its century has been one in which religion is a thing with no juridical life, merely a matter for the piety of the individual. For this revival of the Premonstratensians—of which Belgium has been the centre—has of necessity been a revival at once material and spiritual. Those few courageous survivors of the pre-revolution communities, who came together after forty years of dispersion to restore what had been lost, had to begin at the beginning. The abbeys, where they were not destroyed, were in the hands of lay proprietors—in several cases free-thinkers, willing anything but a restoration of a religious Order. Nevertheless the work went forward. Averbode, the pioneer, began its new life in 1834; Tongerlo, three years later, and by 1841 six of the one-time abbeys had been restored. In 1900 the religious of these six abbeys numbered some 421; to-day the total has risen to 569—and this in a day when the scarcity of vocations is a matter of general lament. Statistics for the state of the whole Order to-day are not available (a new catalogue is in preparation), and one can only give as an indication the figures for 1912. The Order then numbered five circaries: France, with 41 religious; Provence, with 54; Austria, with 365; Hungary with 157, and Brabant, the largest, with 464. Dependent on the abbeys in Austria, Bohemia, Hungary and Belgium are 195 parishes, administering a population of half a million souls. The Hungarian province has, besides, some five colleges, with a student body of 2,054, while the colleges of the circary of Brabant (Belgium and Holland) are educating over 800. Nor does the Order neglect the most potent means of apostolate—the press. In Upper Austria it publishes three papers; the fourteen reviews and magazines of the Belgian Abbeys have a united circulation of several hundred thousand. The Belgian province has flourishing missions in Brazil, the Congo, Denmark, England, and Canada, while the American mission of the Abbey of Berne, in Holland, has developed into an autonomous priory at

West de Pere, Wisconsin, with a college and parishes in the dioceses of Green Bay and Chicago.

The eighteen abbeys which are the centre of this varied activity, independent in all that concerns their individual life, are united in an Order by the General Chapter of all the abbots, and in the person of their Abbot-General. As long as Prémontré stood, the Abbot of Prémontré was, *ex-officio*, General of the Order, but since the abbey disappeared in the whirlwind of the French Revolution the Abbot-General is elected by the General Chapter. The holder of the office at the moment is the Abbot of Schlágl, in Upper Austria, the Right Rev. Norbert Schachinger. He is represented in each circary or province by a vicar-general, who makes the visitations of the abbeys and presides at the provincial chapter. At the head of each abbey is the abbot, elected for life by the canons of the abbey. Once elected, it is his right to name the various officials; the prior, who has charge of the interior discipline of the abbey, sub-prior, cantor, cellarer, master of novices, etc., etc. One office—peculiar, one is inclined to think, to the Order—calls for a special remark—the circator. He is charged with the care of the exterior observance of the rule. It is his duty to note all breaches and, failing a confession in the daily chapter, fraternally to proclaim the omission, thus securing the benefits of the chapter to those of the brethren whose memories are not of the best.

The independence of the abbey, and its freedom from the bureaucratic tendencies of a great centralization, make for individuality in its life and work. On the other hand, centrifugal tendencies find their correction in the General Chapter, which guards the living principle of this varied apostolate, the rule and statutes of the Order.

What is the life of the modern Premonstratensian Canon? What is the rôle of his Order in the Church of the twentieth century? What are the prospects of its future on its eight hundredth birthday? To answer these questions—to the ordinary man the most interesting, perhaps,—the simplest way seems to describe a modern

abbey 'at work.' For this we propose to describe the Abbey of Tongerlo, which has for us the special interest that to it has been given first to re-introduce into England the white habit of St. Norbert.

The Abbey of Tongerlo, situated in the sandy flats of the Belgian Campine, some twenty miles S.E. of Antwerp, was founded in 1130, during the lifetime of St. Norbert. From the beginning generous benefactors endowed the abbey, and when, after the labours of years, these wild lands became, by the labours of the religious, fruitful and remunerative, the abbey's wealth won for it the proud title 'celeberrimum totius Taxandriæ coenobium.' Its abbots were at the same time great prelates and temporal princes, with rights of life and death over their vassals, sitting by right in the estates of the land. The last of these prince-abbots, Godfrey Herman, was worthy of his predecessors. When the Society of Jesus was suppressed, it was his munificence and the co-operation of his religious that saved from a premature end the great work of the Bollandists; and when, in 1789, the Belgians set up, in opposition to the narrow tyrannies of Joseph II, the short-lived Belgian Republic, Abbot Herman maintained three regiments of infantry in the army of the patriots. But another revolution was already rising above the horizon, and seven years later—Belgium now enjoying the régime of liberty, fraternity, and equality—the abbey was suppressed, its religious (125 in number) dispersed, and its demesnes confiscated, to the great loss, *inter alios*, of the six thousand poor fed daily at its gates.

The restoration, impossible during the French occupation and under the Dutch king, William I, began in 1837. The few survivors of the old community came together once more at the château of Broechem. Three years later some of the property at Tongerlo was bought back, and after forty-four years of exile the canons once more took up their life in their old home. The abbey, church, cloisters, all, indeed, save the ancient prelature and a few farm buildings, had disappeared. But with true Belgian courage, the restoration

was commenced, and, by the death of their first superior—Evermode Backx—in 1867, the church and a great part of the abbey had been rebuilt. Under his successor, John De Swert, the monastery recovered its abbatial rank, and the twenty years of his rule saw the beginnings of the overseas expansion of Tongerlo. The first of these enterprises was the foundation of a mission at Crowle, in Lincolnshire, where, thanks to the generosity of a Catholic gentleman, a church was opened in 1872. A few years later a second foundation was made at Spalding, in the same county, and in 1889, at the request of Bishop Herbert Vaughan (the future Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster), the canons of Tongerlo undertook the formation of a new parish at Manchester. The founder of the Manchester mission was Abbot De Swert's successor, Dr. Thomas Louis Heylen, and it was he, too, who, at the request of Leopold II, embarked on the abbey's greatest venture, the mission in the Belgian Congo. The first years of the new settlement cost the lives of ten of the missionaries, their superior amongst them. But the lives so generously offered have borne as rich a fruit, and the work has flourished despite all obstacles. So much so, that in 1910 part of the territory was handed over to the Dominicans. The prefecture, with its four missions, some thousands of Christians and catechumens, its sixty-eight farm-chapels, had become too great for the resources of a single abbey. In the part retained by Tongerlo there were, at the time, some 2,234 Christians, 2,430 catechumens. Since the separation yet another mission has been added to the list, and by 1913 had already to its account 192 Christians and 343 catechumens.

The year after he had thus inaugurated the mission to the Congo, Abbot Heylen was named Bishop of Namur. Leo XIII, who had watched his career with interest since his brilliant student days at Rome, had wished to keep him by him, but, said the Pope: 'I sacrifice him to my love for Belgium.' What was Belgium's gain was shown beyond all doubt when at Namur, throughout the war, Germany, its

soldiers, bishops, and even kings, found yet another successor to those medieval pontiffs, whose privilege and honour it was to defy and correct the atrocities of the barbarian. No man in Belgium to-day, it is safe to say, is more loved and honoured than the one-time Abbot of Tongerlo, the Premonstratensian Bishop of Namur. His successor at Tongerlo was a former Prefect-Apostolic of the Congo mission, Abbot Adrian Deckers. A man of deeply spiritual life, his rule saw great developments in the community and in the foreign missions. The present abbot—the fifty-third—is the Right Rev. Hugo Lamy, a historical scholar of repute. It is sufficient tribute to his ability to note that since his election in 1915, his subjects have increased from 117 to 149! Of these, seventy-seven are priests, twenty-two professed and seventeen novices; there are, besides, among the lay-brothers, twenty-five professed, three novices and five postulants. Many of the religious—canons and brothers—are, of course, engaged in the missions; but resident in the abbey is a community of between eighty and ninety. Never, surely, was Tongerlo more flourishing than to-day, under its fifty-third abbot, when, more than ever, its life and prosperity proclaim to the world the truth of its device, *Veritas Vincit*.

To describe the community life in a present-day abbey does not require very much space. The day is pretty evenly divided between prayer and study, and amongst the different occupations the Divine Office claims our first attention. Matins and Lauds begin the day at 4.0 a.m., followed by the first of the three community Masses, at which those who are not priests communicate. There follows the hour of Prime and meditation—during which is said, though *extra chorum*, the second daily Mass of obligation. Towards the end of Prime takes place, in the chapter-house, the daily chapter, confession of faults, memento of deceased brethren, kinsfolk, and benefactors, after which, singing the *Salve Regina*, the canons return to the church. Terce is sung immediately before the High Mass, at eight o'clock, and immediately after the Mass,

Sext. None, where it does not follow Sext, is said after the mid-day meal, and Vespers—like the High Mass, always sung with full solemnity—at two o'clock. Compline, with night prayers and examination of conscience, brings the day to an end at 7.0 p.m., and by 8.30 all lights are extinguished, and the house at rest. Besides the Divine Office, said or sung thus each day, on most days there is said in addition the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin, devotion to whom and to whose Immaculate Conception has, from the first days of the Order, been one of its chief characteristics. It seems the place here to speak of *the* great devotion of the Order—the Blessed Sacrament. It is a devotion which goes back to the days when, at Antwerp, St. Norbert routed the heresiarch Tanchelin, whose sacerdotal heresies led him to reject the Real Presence. Zeal for the Most Holy Sacrament, and for all that regards Its reservation, has ever since distinguished the Order, and very notably a devotion to the Mass. It is but fitting, then, that Tongerlo should be the centre of the Arch-confraternity of the Mass of Reparation, the idea of which originated with a simple Norbertine lay-sister. The aim of the Confraternity is to make reparation for the neglect of Sunday Mass. This the associates do by hearing Mass on some week-day, or, should they find this impossible, by hearing a second Mass on the Sunday.

To return to the community life: the intervals between the choir Offices are occupied variously. The younger brethren have their classes in theology and philosophy; the priests, where they do not teach, have their personal studies, literary work for the reviews, conferences to prepare, or retreats, while in the church there are always to be found penitents to confess, pious souls come for direction. The purely temporal affairs are, for the most part, in the hands of the lay-brothers, under whose experienced direction the abbey lands are cultivated and the stock cared for, who are the printers, the electricians, and engineers of the community. Every trade and every profession finds here its opportunity, for the abbey supplies all

its own wants—even for the white fur pelisses of the canons special care is given to a famous breed of rabbits, some scores of which occupy a prominent place in the great farm court.

The austerities of the rule have, in some directions, necessarily been lessened with the passing of time, although, on the other hand, the birth of new habits of life—smoking for instance—has been an opportunity for new mortification. The daily fast ceased, even in St. Norbert's own life-time. For a missionary it was hardly practicable. To-day there is a certain proportion of fast days and of abstinence days in place of the older discipline. These austerities bind the canons, even when going out from the abbey they serve as parish priests in some village church. Hence the interesting souvenir of a former abbatial parish that one frequently sees in Belgium—the moat that surrounds the presbytery—for in a time when communications were more difficult, he who had every week at least three abstinences to keep, had no choice but to have his fish always well to hand. But if the fasts have to some extent been mitigated, the silence still remains; and, except for the daily recreation—an hour after dinner and the short interval between supper and Compline—the abbey is stilled as in sleep.

The function of the modern Premonstratensian abbey is manifold. It is a seminary whence go out to all the ends of the earth missionaries and teachers; it is for a local Bishop a reserve whence, at need, he may draw clergy for his diocese, trained in the most spiritual of schools—the life of a contemplative. It forms preachers for retreats and missions, and is (by the colleges it directs and staffs) a centre for higher education. An Order whose rule permits so varied an effort, which to-day carries through with success so many enterprises, and which has so marvellously revived, after what seemed the sleep of death, should be in no anxiety as to its future. If only the present development continues, blessed in the coming years as in the past, it can assuredly look forward to centuries of a life no less

glorious than that which its first eight hundred years have seen. Perhaps more so, for there would seem to be for this ancient Order prospect of yet other activity, of a work in which its dual vocation will find its fullest realization, a work which, of the highest benefit to the Church, would do more than anything else conceivable to accord with the ideal that, centuries ago, inspired St. Norbert. That ideal, as has been noted, circumstances rapidly modified. To-day circumstances are such—in certain countries—that that ideal is a most practical means of apostolate. Such a country is England, such the United States, and this must be excuse for the imaginative finish of this article.

Our age is pre-eminently the age of centralized and co-ordinated effort. Men who hope for success in their enterprises organize their acts, co-ordinate their activities, and secure for the whole, direction from some common centre. Where this is not done there is, in varying degrees, a chaos of overlapping, much effort mis-directed, much energy wasted. Catholics have not been slow to learn this latest lesson from the children of this world, and to apply it to their own work in life—the extension of Christ's Kingdom on earth. Two examples, recent examples, suggest themselves at once. The Hierarchy of the United States forms itself into a permanent committee for the co-ordination and direction of Catholic activity, while, in New York, Archbishop Hayes, with a like end in view, spends thousands of dollars on a survey of diocesan charities. Suppose, then, we had in any one of our large towns a centre of Catholic life whence radiated in all directions every kind of Catholic activity: a parish sufficiently staffed and equipped that it could be a subject for the scientific study of this branch of the ministry, where the practical problems of the day would have some chance of furnishing—as they were solved—valuable contributions to the science of pastoral theology; where the labours of the ministry could be divided according to the abilities of the ministers, where sermons would only be preached by those who *could* preach, and confraternities be in the care of men whose gifts lay in that direction;

our Saviour has been preserved from all stain. Up to then it was considered as a pious belief, having its force and sanction from the solemnity of the Immaculate Conception celebrated for many ages. In the East it was observed in the fifth century, under the title of the Conception of St. Anne. It is not known if it were introduced in the West before the ninth century.

The American Bishops and, strange to say, even the Irish Bishops, of those days did not seem to be aware that the feast was celebrated in the eighth century by their own venerable predecessors in Ireland, as it was also very probably in Naples.

Then the letter appealed to the liturgical books and the writings of the Fathers, especially St. Ephrem, and concluded :—

Although in the primitive ages the attention of the Church was specially directed to the Incarnation, the honour of the Virgin Mother was vindicated every time it was questioned. When Nestorius tried to divide Christ, attributing to His human nature a distinct personality, the Council of Ephesus, in proscribing this novelty, proclaimed Mary Mother of God conformably to the constant teaching of all antiquity. Her perpetual virginity was declared in due course when innovators dared to deny it. Her exemption from all actual sin was established by the Council of Trent in a definition of Faith ; and the same venerable authority described her as Immaculate in a declaration added to the canons regarding original sin. It happened in regard to this doctrine, as with many others, that in the course of time doubts were raised on the Tradition and Faith of the Church. The disputes that occurred on this subject were tolerated with the same patience and the same consideration as the conflict of opinion in regard to the necessity of legal observances at the Council of Jerusalem until the voice of Peter ended the discussion.

Before the events are briefly described that led up to the solemn declaration in 1854, when the voice of Peter again ended the discussion, one letter, and the last, from the Patriarch of Chaldean Babylon, settles any doubts regarding Tradition, if there ever had been any, except on the part of those who did not eagerly desire any definition. He wrote : ‘ Some, moreover, confirm this assertion . . . by words that are very formal. Thus St. Ephrem of Syria has said, “ Mary is stainlessly pure, exempt from

defilement, sheltered from all taint of sin.”’ All know of St. Ephrem.

But the Patriarch then went on to speak about another, whose name is never mentioned by any theologian, not even by Hurter—George Uard, one of the Chaldean doctors, who said much about the Immaculate Conception and spoke still more clearly in some of his verses and hymns composed in honour of the Virgin, for he says : ‘ Who has ever been able to really understand, narrate, and speak about the Virgin Intact and Immaculate, Holy and Sanctified ! who has been clothed with sanctity even from her conception, and destined from the womb of her mother to become the ark, the altar, the temple, the throne, the palace of the living God of Ages ? ’ And, a little further on : ‘ This Fruit which Eve has not seen, but which has been formed in her, guarded and sealed.’ Then again, in the same chant : ‘ The vulture has not spotted her ; it has never clasped her in its claws. The roving spirit has never met her.’ Then he compared her to Gideon’s Fleece : ‘ Mary has never been impregnated by sin ; she alone had been saved from the deluge of sin, having remained intact, as once had Gideon’s Fleece.’ Then the Patriarch quoted a Mohammedan doctor, Nuai, whose words form a fitting conclusion : ‘ In all the human race there has been no creature who has not been wounded by the demon, except Mary and her Son.’ Or as Shelley puts it more eloquently, even though, like Nuai, he was not of the fold :

Sweet benediction in the Eternal Curse,
Veiled glory of this lampless universe,
Thou moon beyond the clouds,
Thou living form among the dead !

The 24th November, 1848, was seemingly a black day for the Church, when Pius IX had to leave the city of the Popes in disguise. The ‘ Circolo Romano ’ were the real rulers on that day. But who financed them, and enabled them to foist themselves on an ungrateful populace ?

England had been bribing Europe since the days of the first Napoleon, and at this period was much interested in the so-called union of Italy, and the suppression of the temporal Papal authority.¹

But British intrigue had this one good effect : while it forced the Pope into temporary exile, it forced him also to turn to her who was the help of Christians, and of Popes in particular. And it was strange that, above all places, Pius IX should have stopped at Gaeta, then in the kingdom of Naples, which, after Ireland, gave the lead to Europe in devotion to the Immaculate Conception a thousand years before and now again gave the lead to the world. And little did English diplomatists think that their schemes would recoil on themselves when, six years later, on a December day, there was scarcely a dry eye in St. Peter's after the *Veni Creator* was intoned. For their move to drive Pius the Persecuted from Rome finished what had been 'a hundred times attempted, a thousand times several times begun.'² The definition of the Immaculate Conception led, twenty years later, to what the English diplomatist dreaded most : the apotheosis of Papal authority—its Infallibility.³ Pius crowned Mary ; Mary crowned Pius.

As far back as the fourteenth century John de Varennes, a parish priest near Rheims, published a little work, *Via pro pace Ecclesiae*, and sent it to Benedict XII, 'asking him to have the feast of the Most Holy Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary celebrated everywhere, to obtain peace for the Church.' His request has been granted long ago ; and more than ever he dreamed of. But that golden era has yet to dawn, and shall, as sure as to-morrow's sun. May

¹ Morley's *Life of Gladstone*, vol. ii. p. 87. Gladstone wrote : 'I am amazed at the Italian Government giving over outside Rome not only the nomination to Bishoprics as offices, but a nomination which carries with it the temporalities of the sees.'

² Gousset, 66.

³ Morley's *Life of Gladstone*, where he wanted the Government to make representation to other European Powers, presumably to have it abolished !

the prayer of Father Faber be realized in our day: 'the speedy coming of that great age of the Church which is the age of Mary,' and in which our own country, that stood up for her privilege first and alone in the Western world, may justly share, and then may she also stand forth in her might and be fresh in her beauty like the Rose!

F. O'NEILL.

VOCATION : ITS ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS

BY REV. JOHN KEARNEY, C.S.SP.

WHAT is the exact meaning of the expression, 'I have a vocation'? How can I find out that I have a vocation? How can I be morally sure, or at least very confident, that a particular person has a vocation? These are practical questions to which it was once difficult to give a clear and satisfactory answer; for, until recently, the question of vocation to the priesthood or to the religious state was involved in much obscurity in spite of all that had been written on the subject. Within recent years, however, considerable light has been thrown on the nature of vocation by documents coming from the Holy See. About the year 1908 a remarkable book on vocation to the priesthood was published in France by a certain Canon Lahitton. The views put forth in this book excited a considerable amount of controversy among the French clergy and religious. In some places the war of opinions and reasons was, at times, very hot indeed. The controversy spread beyond France, and even appeared among the Roman professors, and one very prominent lecturer on theology found himself ultimately on the wrong side. All this is, of course, a clear indication of the difficulty in which the question was involved. The matter was finally referred to the Holy See. The decision on the nature of the priestly vocation was given by Pius X in 1912, and consisted in a full approbation of the teaching set forth in Canon Lahitton's book.¹

The actual text of the Papal decision runs as follows :—

- (1) No one has ever any right to ordination until freely chosen by a Bishop.
- (2) The qualification which should be looked for in a candidate for

¹ *La Vocation Sacerdotale* (Paris : Beauchesne). A work of much interest, not merely for the controversy it excited, but also for its treatment of the whole question.

Orders, and which is called a vocation to the priesthood, by no means consists—at least necessarily or ordinarily—in a certain inward desire, or in the promptings of the Holy Spirit, to enter the priestly state.

(3) On the contrary, to justify his being called to orders by a Bishop, nothing further is required of a candidate than a correct intention and a fitness for the priestly state—a fitness resulting from such gifts of nature and grace, and attested by such probity of life and such attainment of professional knowledge, as would afford a well-grounded hope of his ability to discharge in a proper manner the duties of the priesthood, and worthily fulfil its obligations.¹

With regard to vocation to the religious state there is a very clear statement contained in Canon 538 of the new Code, which says :

Any Catholic can be admitted into religion provided that he is not debarred by any legitimate impediment, that he is inspired by a correct intention, and is fit to bear the burdens of religious life.

The first thing that strikes us on reading these documents is the precise statement that only two conditions are required and are sufficient in a candidate for the priesthood or for the religious state, namely : (1) Fitness for the state in question, (2) a correct intention. And it is very instructive to notice that, according to the teaching of the same Pope Pius X, two similar conditions are necessary and are sufficient for daily Communion.

Vocation to the Priesthood.—From the words of the decree cited above, we may infer that the word ‘vocation’ can be used in two senses : the active or strict sense and the passive or popular sense. In the strict sense, vocation is the calling by God to the priesthood. Of this calling, the Catechism of the Council of Trent says : ‘They are said to be called by God, who are called by His legitimate ministers.’ The same teaching appears in the first lines of the above decree. Hence the true divine vocation or calling to the priesthood comes immediately from the Bishop. No one has a claim to ordination on the ground that a divine vocation has been directly intimated to him by God, and that the divine will must be fulfilled. Until the Bishop calls to Orders, the student is only a candidate for a vocation in the strict sense of the term.

¹ Pius X, 15 July, 1912, *Acta Ap. Sedis*.

In the passive or popular sense, a young man is said to have a vocation when he is a fit subject and offers himself with a correct intention. It came as a surprise to many when they learnt that, to be a suitable candidate, there was no necessity for any inward attraction to the sacerdotal state, for any voice of the Holy Spirit speaking in the heart and inviting to the priesthood. These special graces may be present—are probably rather frequently present—but they are by no means necessary. All that is required in a candidate that he may safely offer himself for the priesthood are the two conditions of fitness and correct intention.

As to fitness. What the Church understands by fitness is fully set forth in the words of the decree. The required qualities of knowledge, virtue, and character must be so manifested as to give a well-grounded hope that the candidate will be a good priest. Of course, in the early years of preparation this manifestation of fitness need not be so evident as it should be later on. For the candidate himself the judges of this fitness are evidently his ordinary confessor, his director, and those charged with his studies.

As to correct intention. The intention of the candidate that is, his motive for selecting the priesthood must be supernatural. A merely natural motive, if it be the only one, makes him an unsuitable candidate. Those who offer themselves solely because they see in the priesthood a desirable profession, a profession pleasing to their parents, a state of life in which one is much respected, a career without great hardship: all such have no vocation. The candidate must look on the priesthood from the supernatural point of view and desire it because he wishes to give himself to Christ as a labourer in the great harvest field, of which it is written that the harvest is great but the labourers few, or because he wishes to live in intimate union with Jesus and have the privilege of saying Mass, or even because he hopes to save his soul with more security by giving his life to priestly work.¹ Correct intention, as

¹ Many would question the soundness of this last intention.

the Church means it, arises, with the aid of God's grace, from serious reflection on the priesthood, on its privileges, and its obligations. In cases where the intention seems twofold—natural and supernatural—care must be taken that the supernatural intention is really present and predominant, at least in the later stages of the time of preparation.

Vocation to the Religious State.—What has been said above about the priestly vocation applies also, with the obvious modifications, to the religious vocation. To offer oneself as a candidate for a noviciate, two conditions, and two only, are required: fitness and a correct intention. No particular taste for the religious state or distaste for the world is necessary. St. Teresa offers a very clear illustration of this truth. In her autobiography she writes: 'Although I could not bend my will to be a nun, I saw that the religious state was the best and safest, and thus little by little, I resolved to force myself into it.'¹ With regard to the correct intention we should notice that, while the salvation and perfection of others is the direct end of the priesthood, personal salvation and perfection is the direct end of the religious state. This gives us the source of the ordinary difference between the correct intention in the case of the priesthood and in the case of the religious life. We should also note that the correct intention must include the firm will to persevere in the religious state.² The two conditions named above constitute what is called a vocation to religion in the ordinary sense; they make one a suitable candidate. We may, perhaps, complete the parallel with the priestly vocation by comparing the call to profession at the end of the noviciate with the call of the Bishop to ordination. In each case we have a vocation in the strict sense.

Obligation to follow a Vocation.—The above doctrine on the nature of a vocation leads naturally to the conclusion that the mere possession of the twofold qualification for

¹ Chap. ii.

² Vermeersch, *Epit. Jur. Can.*, 515 (Roma, 1921).

the priesthood or the religious state does not imply any obligation to enter either, no more than the possession of the similar twofold condition for daily Communion implies any obligation to receive. They simply indicate that the way is open.

With regard to the priesthood, there is evidently no obligation on anyone to present himself for Orders, unless in very exceptional circumstances. This is admitted by all, and follows from the fact that the priesthood is not primarily for the advantage of the individual, but for the advantage of the community—*nemo fit sibi sacerdos*. In the new Code (c. 937) the Bishop is forbidden to force anyone in Orders to advance to a higher order.

With regard to the religious vocation, it is the safe and sure teaching that the general vocation spoken of above does not bring with it any obligation.¹ The religious state is primarily a matter of counsel and not of command. St. Thomas teaches that 'the advice given to the young man by Christ is to be understood as given to all'²; and a simple advice addressed to everyone cannot imply any obligation. St. Ambrose says: 'Quod igitur bonum est, non vitandum est: Quod est melius eligendum est. Itaque non imponitur sed praeponitur.'³ What, then, are we to think of those authors who speak so severely of the neglect of a religious vocation? A solution of this difficulty—at least in many cases—is suggested by the fact that, although nothing further is required in the candidate than fitness and a correct intention, yet much more may be present in that soul. Special dangers to salvation from a life in the world may point out the religious state as an almost necessary means. Special light and special attraction may be given by God which, taken with the internal and external history of the life, indicate with sufficient clearness the Will of God that this particular soul should be consecrated

¹ Vermeersch, *De Vocatione*, art. iv.

² St. Thomas, *Contra retrahentes*, ix.; Prummer, *de Jur. Can.*, No. 200 (1920).

³ *De Viduis*, c. 12.

to Him in religion. We may, then, distinguish the general vocation as described above, and the special vocation which exists in the case of those who receive a more definite indication of God's Will. Evidently, the deliberate rejection of this latter vocation will call for prudent deliberation and demand a proportionately serious reason, if only because of the charity to oneself therein necessarily involved.

In considering the obligation that may exist to follow a religious vocation, we should notice the statement of the Code (c. 637) that a religious, when temporary vows have expired, may freely return to the world. This, at first sight, might seem to do away with any obligation to follow a religious vocation. Such a conclusion would, however, be incorrect. The meaning of the canon seems to be this: The Church, knowing that a subject may, in a short time, by infidelity to grace, lose that fitness for the religious state which was actually present during the noviciate year, wishes to leave the door to the world open, so that the religious society may have the possibility of being purified, and hence, in this canon, gives freedom to the subject. She also wished to provide for the exceptional case in which, without any fault on the part of the subject, a mistaken judgment was arrived at about his fitness for the religious state. (According to St. Thomas, there are even temporary vocations.¹)

The Church, however, does not state that every one is free in the sense that he has no obligation to follow the call of special grace, i.e., of a special vocation. On the contrary, she seems to suppose that, in most cases, there is a neglect of special grace on the part of those who leave religion after temporary vows, and hence she looks upon them with much suspicion and little favour. This appears from Canon 642, which forbids Bishops to bestow any of the more important positions of trust in the diocese on those priests who leave religion after six years profession. The Church, we know, is lenient in her law; she inflicts a disability only in extreme cases; and hence, from the

¹ *Contra retrahentes*, x.

above disability, we may reasonably conclude as to her unfavourable opinion of the great majority of those who avail themselves of the canonical freedom given after three years' vows, whether they be in Holy Orders or not. And indeed it is natural to think that any one who has gone through the noviciate and lived some years in religion must have received very considerable graces, so that even if he began with only the general vocation, he will, in most cases, have come into the class of those who have the responsibility of a special call.

Giving Advice on Vocation.—One very practical conclusion may be drawn from the above Roman doctrine on the nature of a vocation to the priesthood or the religious state. If any one is asked advice, and if he consider that the twofold condition is present, he need have no fear that he is anticipating God's Will in advising the candidate to offer himself either for the religious state or for the priesthood. He is not even free (says Vermeersch) to give a contrary advice in the case of the religious state.¹ And, in the case of the priesthood, the Code is very plain-spoken indeed (c. 971) : 'It is altogether unlawful (*nefas*) in any way and for any reason to turn aside any canonically suitable subject from the clerical state.' Moreover, he can, before any advice is asked, suggest either of these states to the consideration of the young who are otherwise suitable, and he can, by pointing out the advantages, lead them to conceive the correct intention ; and this he can do without any fear that he is leading a soul to a state of life for which that soul has no divine vocation. We may add that the new Code (c. 1353) imposes on all priests this cultivation of ecclesiastical vocations, and, as regards religious life, St. Thomas teaches that it is most laudable to persuade anyone to embrace that state : 'Inducentes alios ad religionem non solum non peccant sed magnum praeium merentur.'²

JOHN KEARNEY, C.S.SP.

¹ *Th. Mor.*, iii. 107 (Roma, 1921).

² II. II. q. 189, a. 2.

STUDIES IN IRISH MONETARY HISTORY

BY DOM P. NOLAN, O.S.B., M.A.

IV

IRISH COINS OF THE DANES AND ANGLO-SAXONS

THAT money was coined by the Danish rulers of Dublin and other Irish seaports admits of no doubt, as numerous specimens are extant, of which Simon gives illustrations. We have many coins of Sitric III, Danish King of Dublin, who, according to Ware, began to reign about 989, and died in 1029 on a pilgrimage to Rome. They bear on one side his effigy and name and on the other the name of the 'Monetarius,' i.e., the moneyer, master or farmer of the mint, who contracted for the issue of the coin¹; and also the name of the town where the coin was minted or circulated; e.g., one coin bears on the obverse the King's effigy, with the legend SIHTRC REX DYFLN (Sitric, King of Dublin), and on the reverse the words FÆREMAN MO DYFLI (Færeman, Moneyer, Dublin).

It is a curious fact that the name of this same Dublin moneyer is found on coins of Ethelred II, King of England (979-1016), who was a contemporary of Sitric III of Dublin. 'I have,' says Simon, 'a coin of Ethelred II, king of England (the like of which is in the collection of the Earl of Pembroke, and in that of the late Dr. Gilbert in Trinity College, Dublin), struck in Dublin by the same Færeman. It has on one side that prince's head crowned, and this inscription, ÆDELRED REX ANGLO (Ethelred, King of the English); reverse, a cross crescent and FÆREMAN MO

¹ The *Monetarii*, says Simon, were not mere coiners or workmen, but 'farmers of the mint, who gave so much a year to the prince for the sole privilege of coining in a city or town.'

DYFLI (Færeman, Moneyer, Dublin).’ Ethelred reigned in England from 979–1016, and was a contemporary of Sitric, son of Aulaf, or Anlaf, Danish King of Dublin, who succeeded his brother, Gluniarand, in 989. Another coin of Ethelred has the same obverse, and on the reverse a cross crescent and the letters FÆNEMNMODYFLI, which seem to mean Fænemn (? Færeman), Moneyer, Dublin, but Simon makes the second N stand for Normanorum, which is hardly a plausible suggestion.

He also attempted¹ to account for the appearance of a Dublin moneyer’s name on the coin of a Saxon king by the fact that Ethelred’s father, King Edgar (959–975), is said to have conquered the city and kingdom of Dublin, and a great part of Ireland, and these coins may represent tribute levied on the conquered territory, over which the Saxon king and his successors may have claimed a signory or overlordship.

But this again is hardly plausible, and besides we have no certain historical proof that Edgar ever did really conquer Dublin, which was, moreover, only a Danish city and did not carry with it the lordship of Ireland. It is true he is made to put forward this claim in a charter (by some, thought to be spurious) in which he thanks God, Who made him not only king of all England, but ‘all the kingdoms of the islands of the ocean, with their fierce kings, as far as Norway, and a great part of Ireland with its most noble city of Dublin, all which by the Divine Providence I have subdued.’² On the other hand, we do know that the Northmen overran England in the reign of his son, Ethelred II, or the Unready, who adopted the plan of buying them off with money—the well-known Danegeld—for which he taxed his people. In 1013 Swegen

¹ *Essay, etc.*, p. 8. He has stolen the idea from Keder’s work : *Nummorum in Hibernia antequam haec insula sub Henrico II Angliae Rege anglici facta sit juris cusorum Indagatio*. Leipsic (Leipzig), 1708, p. 27.

² Ware, *Antiq.* ; Flaherty, *Ogygia*. Davies, in his ‘Report of mixt monies,’ says ‘the easterlings were the first founders of the four principal cities of Ireland, viz., Dublin, Waterford, Cork, and Limerick. . . . These cities and towns were under the protection of Edgar, and Edward the Confessor.’

actually wrested the kingdom of England from Ethelred, who fled to the court of Normandy, and on his death in 1016, a Danish dynasty ascended the English throne in the person of Cnut. Could these Dublin coins of Færeman have any connexion with the Danegeld?

Ruding¹ is disposed to believe in Edgar's conquest of Ireland, but not in the hypothesis Simon builds thereon:—

The conquest of great part of Ireland [he says], with its most noble city, Dublin, of which Eadgar boasts in a charter granted by him to the church of Worcester, A.D. 964, has been treated by some as a fiction of the monks. But although the charter itself be allowed to be spurious (and it must be confessed that, from internal evidence, its genuineness is much to be suspected), yet it by no means follows that the conquests of Eadgar which it enumerates must necessarily be without foundation. That . . . of Ireland receives great confirmation from the circumstance of coins having been struck in Dublin by Aethelred, who succeeded to the crown of England not more than four years after the death of Eadgar; for it is impossible to show by what means he established a mint there, unless a prior conquest of that city should be admitted; and it is not even pretended that either he, or his predecessor Eadward were the conquerors of Ireland. . . . It has been conjectured that Eadgar did not keep possession of the city of Dublin, but only imposed a tribute on its king; and that these coins, with the name of Aethelred, were struck for the purpose of paying it, and as an acknowledgment of dominion and right of protectorship. But . . . it will require much, and that very evident, proof to induce us to admit that coins were ever formed with such intentions.

'Silver pennies,' says Thorburn,² 'bearing the names of Aethelred and Cnut and place of mintage, Dublin, are generally classed as Irish coins. . . . These pieces are inferior in workmanship and often in metal to the English coins, and were, it is supposed, struck by Irish kings in imitation of English money.'

But there are even earlier instances of Irish names on Saxon coins. Thoresby mentions a piece of King Edgar (959–975) which is reproduced by Simon. It has EADGAR REX on the obverse, and on the reverse DYRMOD MONE, i.e., Dermot Moneyer. 'This piece,' says Thoresby, 'being found in digging among some antient ruins in Dublin, was sent me as an Irish coin, Dermot, the minter's name, being

¹ *Annals, etc.*, i. p. 131.

² *Coins of Great Britain, etc.*, p. 184.

familiarly known to those that are conversant in the Irish annals.' Simon says that if we are to admit this coin as Irish, Dermot may have been a petty king whom Edgar had subdued, the coin being a tribute imposed upon him, and so he would interpret MONE as = Moneta, i.e., money; but here again his supposition is gratuitous.

The name of Dermot appears on a still earlier Anglo-Saxon coin, i.e., on one of Edred, King of the English (946-955), of which Simon gives an engraving (Plate I, No. 9). The obverse has EDWARD REX, and the reverse DYRMOD M.

It will be noticed that the place of minting is not inscribed on these coins of Edgar and Edred, and, although the name of the moneyer is Irish, it does not necessarily follow that the coins were struck in Ireland. The Irish, we know, were much more advanced in the arts than their English neighbours, and this Dermot may have been a clever Irish craftsman whom the Saxon kings employed as their minter. We may remark that the chief adviser of both the kings, Edred and Edgar, was the great St. Dunstan, who owed much of his early training to Irish monks at Glastonbury, and who was, himself, skilled in metal-work, and it is not impossible that there may have been official Irish minters at Glastonbury. In like manner, Færeman, whose name appears on the coin of Ethelred, may have been a skilled artificer who coined for all comers. At the same time it is, of course, possible that some of the early Saxon plunderers of Ireland may have had coins struck in that country as tokens of their pretended overlordship. The legendary invasion and conquest of Ireland by Edgar was far from being the first intrusion into our country of plunderers from England.

As far back as the year 684, or nearly five hundred years before the Norman Invasion, the Saxon King of Northumbria savagely devastated the plains of Meath. 'In this year,' says the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 'Ecgerth sent an army against the Scots (Irish), and Berht, his aldorman, with it; and miserably they afflicted and burned

God's churches.'¹ The *Annals of Ulster*,² Tighernach, and other Irish annalists record the same: 'The Saxons wasted Magh-Bregh³ and several churches in the month of June.' This brutal conduct of the Saxon king is all the more inhuman as the Irish had only just granted a refuge to Aldfrith, his natural brother and successor.

'In the — year of Our Lord's Incarnation,' writes Venerable Bede, 'Egfrid, King of the Northumbrians, sending Beort his general with an army into Ireland, miserably wasted that harmless nation, which had always been friendly to the English; insomuch that in their hostile rage they spared not even the churches or monasteries. Those islanders, to the utmost of their power, repelled force with force, and imploring the assistance of the Divine mercy, prayed long and fervently for vengeance; and though such a curse cannot possess the Kingdom of God, it is believed that those who were justly cursed on account of their impiety, did soon suffer the penalty of their guilt from the avenging hand of God; for the very next year that same king' was ambushed and killed by the Picts.

His friends, and St. Cuthbert especially, had warned him against attacking the Picts, but he was deaf to their advice, a punishment, in Bede's opinion, because the year before he refused 'to listen to the most reverend father, Egbert, who advised him not to attack Ireland (Scottiam) which did him no harm. . . . From that time the hope and strength of the English Crown began to waver and retrograde.'

P. NOLAN, O.S.B.

[To be continued.]

¹ ' . . . sende Egferdh here on Scottas . . . earnlice hi Godes cyrican hyridan ⁊ baerndon.'

² 'Saxones campum Brigh vastant et ecclesias plurimas.'

³ Bregia, a part of Meath.

ONE OF THE HOMES OF THE SOUTHERN GERALDINES: CLUAN CASTLE

BY J. B. CULLEN

THERE are many places in Ireland whose history, in the changes of time, came to be forgotten, or at least was left unwritten, although the ruins and memorials that exist amid their scenes bespeak, in silence, that in ages long gone by those now crumbling walls were raised by noble builders, but who, it may be said, seemingly built only for either of two objects—Faith or War. The reminiscences of one of these unfrequented localities form the subject of the following pages.

About two miles below the picturesque little town of Inistioge, in the county of Kilkenny—close to the water-side of the Nore—stand the striking remains of the Castle of Clonamery, locally known as Cluan. The position of the ruin, crowning as it does the summit of a conical mound of considerable elevation, is remindful of some of the feudal castles so numerous along the banks of the Rhine. The romantic appearance of this old Irish castle is enhanced by the wooded crags on the opposite side of the river, that extend to the upland plantations of Woodstock demesne. Stretching away from the site of the ruined tower is the broad mead¹ from which it takes its name, and immediately beyond it are the remains of an early church of St. Brendan the Navigator, while in the distance to the west is the lofty mountain that still preserves his name—‘Brandon Hill.’ The whole surroundings are full of interest, not only in the way of natural charm, but as well on account of the many landmarks of history and tradition that are in evidence on every side.

¹ *Cluan* signifies ‘meadow’ in Irish. It might possibly mean in this case retreat or monastery, as *Cluain*.

Cluan Castle, in the olden days, was the home and part of the inheritance of a branch of the noble and war-like Geraldines, who played so conspicuous a part in the story of Ireland from the twelfth to the seventeenth centuries. Although their vast possessions were chiefly identified with Leix and Offaly (the present Kildare), and also with a considerable part of Munster—proverbially known as ‘the Desmond country’—it would seem that in the division of lands that were parcelled out among the followers of Strongbow and the Norman leaders of the English Invasion, a few detached moieties of the kingdom of Ossory came into the hands of this powerful family. The heads of the respective houses who represented minor branches of the Fitzgeralds in this part of the country came to be better known by the alias of ‘Baron,’ and hence were usually styled ‘the Barons of Burntchurch,’ of ‘Brownsford,’ and of ‘Cluan.’ They were lords of their respective fiefs—the title of distinction conferred upon them being one of those commonly bestowed by the Lords Palatine at this period on holders of sub-grants of land, by virtue of the powers and privileges vested in them by the Crown. Hence, though the Geraldine castles of the localities to which we refer are almost bereft of any traditions of the families that founded them—the surname of ‘Barron’ is, at the present day, plentiful enough among the occupiers of the lands adjacent to the ruined homes of the liege lords of the bygone manors, whose name they bear.

Maurice Fitzgerald, first Knight of Kerry, commonly called ‘the Black Knight,’ is said to be the progenitor of the Fitzgeralds or ‘Barons,’ whose descendants may be traced in several parts of Kilkenny, and thence became connected by marriage and otherwise with the adjoining counties. For some reason, difficult now to determine, the descendants of the Lords of Burntchurch, Brownsford, and Cluan seem to have adhered to the custom of using the name ‘Baron’ for many centuries, for it was only in the sixteenth century the surname of Fitzgerald was adopted by them to any extent. The confiscation of their estates

following soon afterwards, and, in the vicissitudes of time and change, the memories of personalities being forgotten, the older designation survived in the form familiar to those acquainted with the districts to which we have been alluding.

The trend of our present brief sketch is mainly intended to invest the ruined castle by the River Nore with an episode of tragic interest: the story of Edward Fitzgerald, the last Baron of Cluan, who was a stirring figure in the Revolution of 1689, when he espoused the ill-fated cause of James II.

At the time young Fitzgerald was born the fortunes of his house had declined—for, as with so many noble and Catholic families of the time, adherence to the old Faith and later on their allegiance to the cause of the Stuart kings were fruitful of misfortune. His grandfather, Edmond Fitzgerald, took a prominent part in the Revolution of 1641, and was one of the Commoners who assisted at the Convocation of the General Assembly, held at Kilkenny in 1647. Under the Commonwealth he was attainted, when his estates, consisting of the lands of Cluan, Brownsford, Ballygub and Curraghmore, were confiscated, and were divided between Thomas Le Strange, Protestant Bishop of Ossory, and one Matthew Marks. After the Restoration of Charles II portion of the property apparently reverted to the representative of the original proprietor, since, in the return of an inquisition, dated 1664, it is recorded that Edward Fitzgerald (the subject of our memoir) was seized of the townlands of Brownsford and Curraghmore. This regrant, which was only that of a fragment of the original lands (some fifty or sixty acres), was presumably made in the lifetime of his father, who then occupied Cluan Castle.

Owing to the disabilities of Catholics in the Penal times to procure education for their children at home, Edward was sent to St. Omer, France, where a celebrated college, established by the Jesuits, was much frequented by Irish students.¹ At the time the town (St. Omer) was an

¹ In later times it was here O'Connell was educated.

important military station, remarkable for its fortifications, and for the facilities of defence afforded by the flooding of the River An, which in cases of emergency could be made to circumvent the entire citadel. On this account, St. Omer became a favourite place for the study of military tactics with scions of the French nobility who aspired to the profession of arms. Whilst here young Fitzgerald made the acquaintance of many fellow-students, who afterwards became famous soldiers in the French service. Among his companions were the Chevaliers de Tasse and de Lauzun, both of whom, like himself, were afterwards destined to play a remarkable part on the battlefields of Ireland. During holiday times he often enjoyed hospitality in the homes of his young friends, with whose families he was especially popular, on account of his bright and genial disposition and his nobility of character. He was, moreover, an accomplished musician, and as he excelled in playing the harp, often thrilled his listeners with the wild strains and melodies of his native land. Amidst such surroundings, it is easy to imagine how the enthusiastic young Irishman became enamoured of a soldier's life. When he finished his studies he resolved to enter the army, joining an Irish regiment, then in the French service, and under the command of Captain George Hamilton—a countryman of his own. During the campaign of 1664–5 the Irish corps, under Marshal Turenne, by their bravery, contributed largely to the defeat of the German army and to the brilliant victory of the French forces. After the battle of Salsbach (1675), where Turenne fell, and the death of Hamilton a year later, the Irish regiment was disbanded for want of recruits to fill the ranks, and its officers compelled to take the alternative of seeking commissions in foreign service elsewhere, or of returning to Ireland.

The prospects of the Catholic cause in this country were then gloomy enough. The Penal enactments that disgraced the last years of Charles II were in full swing, yet the apparent fact that on the death of the King the Crown would devolve on a Catholic successor, in the person of his

brother, James, cheered the hopes of the persecuted people. Whether actuated by these influences or by the wish to abandon the career of a soldier in a foreign land, Edward Fitzgerald decided on returning to his native country, and eventually took up his abode in his ancestral castle on the banks of the Nore. In the year 1685 we find he was elected Portreeve of Inistioge, and during the five years that followed was re-elected to fill that office.

On the outbreak of the war of 1689, when the Lord Lieutenant, Talbot, Earl of Tyrconnell, issued commissions to several Catholic noblemen and members of the gentry to raise troops for the King's service, Fitzgerald was one of the first to rally to the standard of James II. At his own expense he mustered a company of foot, which were incorporated with the infantry, commanded by Colonel Butler. Among those who accompanied King James from France, when he landed at Kinsale, were many of Fitzgerald's former companions-in-arms, a circumstance that, no doubt, increased his enthusiasm in the hapless cause he had espoused.

At Cluan Castle he was visited by Chevalier de Lauzun, when the latter, in command of some forces, was about proceeding to reinforce the garrison at Duncannon, Co. Wexford. The entertainment at Cluan seems to have lasted for several days, and was carried out with all the lavish hospitality proverbial of Irish hosts in those times. De Lauzun and his fellow-officers are said to have expressed their enthusiastic admiration for the loveliness of the surrounding country, and preserved a longing remembrance of viands and wines, mirth and music, that enlivened their visit to the Castle. On their departure the Baron accompanied his guests, afterwards sharing in all their deliberations and subsequent preparations to join King James at the Boyne. After the defeat and flight of the worthless monarch, Fitzgerald, with a detachment of the Irish army, not yet disheartened, made his way to Limerick and helped in the brave defence of the city. The incidents of the siege of Limerick are too well known to need rehearsal here. Having lost 2,000 men, William, Prince of Orange, after four days, raised the siege

and withdrew his army to Waterford. Thence he himself embarked for England.

At Limerick victory had fallen to the Irish, but during the winter that followed the army had to experience great hardship and suffering. Early in the spring Tyrconnell returned from France with some money, given him by Louis XIV, in aid of the campaign, and in May a small fleet sailed up the Shannon with provisions and clothing. This infused new hopes into the dispirited hearts of the Irish leaders, but, as no troops had come from France, they had now to depend solely on the native army. St. Ruth came over with the convoy of supplies, and among the few officers who accompanied him were the Chevaliers de Tasse and d'Ussen—old school-fellows of Edward Fitzgerald at St. Omer. Despite the cheerless outlook, forces were again rallied, till the Irish army mustered 20,000 strong, under the command of St. Ruth and Sarsfield. In all the closing scenes of the brave but fruitless struggle Fitzgerald took a prominent part. After the fall of Athlone he accompanied his commanders to the fatal field of Aughrim. Here, as most of us know, St. Ruth was slain at a moment when certain victory seemed almost in his grasp—and beside him fell Edward Fitzgerald, the last Baron of Cluan! In his final struggle his hand was severed from his wrist, and was, 'tis said, picked up by one of his faithful followers as a precious relic of his noble master. Tradition has it that, three days afterwards, his riderless steed, breathless and foam-covered, drew up at the courtyard gate of Cluan Castle—the herald of the unspoken tale. News travelled slowly in those times, but at last the truth, too true, was brought by some fugitives, it is supposed—but more probably by some of the old retainers of the Castle, who had shared and followed the fortunes of their fallen chief. Certain it is that Fitzgerald's sword was brought from Aughrim by a faithful henchman or horse-boy, and found its way eventually to the Museum of the Kilkenny Archaeological Society some sixty years ago.

With the death of the brave but hapless hero of Aughrim

the Geraldine associations of the Castle of Cluan came to an end. The '*Last of the Barons of Cluan*,' who mingled in the fray of many a battlefield in France and in Ireland, was destined to sleep his last sleep in a nameless grave, beyond the waters of Shannon. However, his deeds of valour in the dual cause he espoused—that of his faith and fatherland—are as noble as those of any of the brave Geraldines from whose race he sprang.

The fragment of lands he held (only as tenant) passed, after his death, into the hands of the second Duke of Ormonde, who had inherited all the adjoining estates, the greater part of which, previous to the dissolution of monasteries (under Henry VIII), belonged to the Priory of Inistioge.

In the opening part of our essay we noted that an early church of St. Brendan lay in close proximity to the site of Cluan Castle. This little fane was originally an oratory, erected in the seventh century by the mariner-saint when he visited this part of Ireland, after he returned from his wanderings over the trackless ocean in quest of the island Paradise of his dreams, *The Isle of the Blest*.¹ Whilst here, St. Brendan was visited by one of his former fellow-students at the great monastic school of Clonard, St. Colum-Kille. The latter, on this occasion, founded a monastery on the site of the town of Inistioge—somewhat further up, beside the River Nore. In the Norman period this religious settlement was refounded (1210) by Thomas, son of the Seneschal of Leinster, and dedicated to the Blessed Virgin and St. Colum-Kille, its original patron.² Thenceforward it became a Priory of the Canons-Regular. This now so-called abbey flourished till the Reformation, and after its dissolution was granted, with all its belongings, by Queen Elizabeth, to Edmund Butler, Earl of Ormonde. Its last Abbot, Milo Fitzgerald (alias Baron), who became Bishop of Ossory,

¹ The little sanctuary of St. Brendan was in the thirteenth century restored and enlarged by the Canons-Regular of Inistioge who served it.

² St. Colum-Kille is patron of two or three other parishes in the diocese of Ossory.

rebuilt the tower and cloisters, of which portions of the ruins remain. Within the precincts of the venerable monastery, strangely enough, both the modern Catholic and Protestant churches are built, almost side by side.

Perhaps the threads of history which we have briefly tried to weave round the time-stricken Castle of Cluan may, in a little way, serve to awaken memories of events, long-forgotten, but worthy of record in the Catholic annals of our country.

J. B. CULLEN.

NOTES AND QUERIES

THEOLOGY

PROTESTANTS AND SACRAMENTAL ABSOLUTION

REV. DEAR SIR,—I should be thankful if you would say what you hold on the question of absolving a Protestant in danger of death. Does Canon 731, No. 2, include such persons, and, if so, what about Noldin (page 342) and Arregui (page 384), who speak of conditional absolution in the case? My difficulty is that you are not sure either of the Baptism or the faith of such people. The presumption indeed is against them on both heads, and the chances are if such a person recovered he would not profess the Catholic Faith.

Will a general act of faith do, *in extremis*, that will be denied on recovery; and, faith or no faith, if Baptism was invalid, what is the good of absolution? Would not it be better to try and get a trusted Protestant, one of the many we know in Ireland, to make an act of contrition and help the dying man to make it, and leave faith and sacraments out of the question; and if he can be got to make an act of contrition, which I assume is quite possible for a *bona fide* Protestant, will not he get pardon from God?

P.P.

If the dying Protestant is in possession of his senses, and has ample opportunity of becoming reconciled to the Catholic Church, we see no justification whatever for administering the Sacrament. It is distinctly forbidden by Canon 731, which embodies a principle as old as the Church herself. She forces her favours on nobody. And on principle she is bound to refuse them to those who repudiate the obligations imposed by her Founder. If a man rejects her authority, he has no right to the blessings she is commissioned to bestow. If he persists in his rebellion against her, it becomes an act of disloyalty on the part of her servants to treat him as one of her obedient subjects.

But let us suppose that he is unconscious, or—what amounts practically to the same—that he has no time or opportunity for explicit reconciliation. May an absolution be given then? And, if it be given, is there much to be said for its validity? Whatever about theory, authorities are by no means agreed on the practical reply. Nor is that a matter for surprise. There are too many conflicting principles, and too many doubts that depend for solution on the actual practices of various sects and various localities. And what would be the correct

answer in one country or district may be very far from the truth in another.

But Canon 731 presents, we think, no unsurmountable obstacle in this connexion. It should, we believe, be understood of those who have facilities, not of those for whom compliance is a physical impossibility. We might refer to several considerations that tend to support that contention. But one is enough; and the fact that it is supplied by the Code itself gives it an added value. In Canon 752, § 3, we are told that Baptism may be conferred on those whose previous life gives reasonable grounds for hope, even though at the present moment they are unconscious and unable to ask for its administration. If pagans may receive Baptism without formal admission to the Church, heretics (one would conclude) may, in similar circumstances, receive Penance without formal reconciliation.

Nor need we fully share 'P.P.'s' difficulties in regard to faith. There are 'Protestants,' of course, especially in Continental countries, who have no faith whatever—but we may leave them out of our account for the moment. The typical Protestant, with whom 'P.P.' is likely to come into contact, may be taken as blessed with at least the minimum amount of faith required for the Sacrament.

But there is a difficulty about Baptism. If the Protestant is not baptized, there is no possibility of his validly receiving any other Sacrament. And no one can furnish a short formula enabling us to say whether a Protestant is baptized or not. So much depends on fact—on the rites and practices of the different sects. The term 'Protestant' is very elastic. It embraces men whose Baptism is absolutely certain; also, at least in popular parlance, men who, beyond all doubt, are pagans still. To attempt a short reply that would cover these two extremes, and all the intermediate categories, would be obviously hopeless. It can only be said that, other conditions being presumed, the justification for administering the Sacrament varies directly with the probability that, in the particular sect to which the dying man belongs, the sacrament of Baptism is validly conferred.

There is still greater difficulty about intention. External facts may be gauged satisfactorily: internal intention is hard to analyse. Especially is that true when we have evidence of two intentions mutually contradictory. A Protestant intends, we may suppose, to do all that Christ commanded; but he intends also not to receive the sacrament of Penance as administered in the Catholic Church. Which intention prevails? There is wide room for discussion. We may illustrate the difficulty of giving a definite answer by recalling decisions in parallel instances. A man intends to be married as Christ directed he should: he intends also to seek a divorce afterwards, if matters turn out unfavourable. Which intention predominates? It has been decided often that the first—the *more* general—absorbs the second, as a rule. But, take another instance. The Anglican authorities, we may presume, intend to carry out Christ's law in regard to Ordination: they intend also not to tolerate the sacrificial idea, and to exclude all mention of

it in their Ordination formulae. Which is the real intention there? We are left in no doubt. The pronouncement of Pope Leo XIII on Anglican Orders makes it absolutely clear that in this case the second intention—the *less general*—is the one to be taken into account. Keeping facts of this kind in mind, what are we to say of the dying Protestant? Theologians have differed on the point. Our predecessors in this country would, we are sure, strongly favour the view that his intention is defective. Modern theologians, especially on the Continent, are inclined to the opposite. It is mostly a question of fact; and the more tolerant atmosphere of recent times gives the second view a continually increasing probability.

And then there is the question of general policy. If the Sacrament is granted, what will be the attitude of the invalid in case he recovers? Still more important, what will be the view taken by Protestants, or by Catholics, if they come to know what happened? Will the former be embittered, or the latter scandalized, by this 'communication with heretics in divine matters'? Remembering how deeply considerations of this kind affected the question of baptizing the children of pagans, we can realize how far these questions of fact must affect our attitude on the parallel question of Penance.

These are the main considerations. And they are numerous enough to make the problem troublesome. When a man has to pass several cross-roads and is doubtful about all of them, his chances of arriving at his destination are decreased in geometrical proportion. So it is in all practical matters. If only one issue is in doubt, the course is comparatively simple: if doubts affect several independent issues, the trouble is increased geometrically. Let us suppose, in connexion with 'P.P.'s' problem, that the doubts about Baptism (apart from every other consideration) leave the probabilities equal as regards the *lawfulness* of administering Penance. Let us suppose that the same may be said in reference to the other two points—intention and general policy. Then, *all things considered*, there will be one chance in eight that Penance may be lawfully conferred; and we rather think that, in such circumstances, the ordinary confessor will recall the principle *Sacramenta sunt propter homines* and proceed to administer the Sacrament.

In practice, the probabilities cannot be stated so mathematically, nor will they always correspond, even in a vague way, with the standard mentioned. In this country, they will likely be more favourable under the first two headings: very likely less favourable under the third—unless, as can easily be arranged, the Sacrament is so administered that no one but the priest himself is aware of the fact. Perhaps, though, the final probability arrived at—one in eight—is not very far from the truth.

And in any case the course outlined by 'P.P.' is highly advisable. Even when a man seems to have lost his senses, there are good grounds for hope that he may be aware of what is happening around him, and may be influenced by the suggestions of a religiously-minded member of his own persuasion. When he still retains control of his senses, the chances in his favour are greater still. An act of contrition, we may hope, is not so very difficult. *If elicited*, it will restore him to God's friendship, whether Baptism or Penance have been administered or not.

MASS HONORARIA AND LOCAL OBLIGATION

I

REV. DEAR SIR,—Your decision on the query in the December (1921) I. E. RECORD *re* Mass Honoraria and Local Obligation, induces me to put the following query :—

A certain lady bequeathed stipendia for Masses to be said in a certain church of a certain Order. It is believed that she left the legacy owing to her attachment to the church, but that is only a surmise. Her mentioning the church may possibly have been with a view to meeting a legal formality. The local Superior, when approached by the executors of the lady's will, did not accept the obligation of the Masses at all. The questions then arise : Was the Superior within his right in refusing to accept the Masses ? Assuming that he was, were the executors then free to have the Masses celebrated wherever they wished, v.g., in China ? Or were they bound to submit the case to the Bishop's decision ?

This case does not seem to me to come under any of the three conclusions given in the I. E. RECORD, June, 1913, *re* Local Obligation of Masses. This case is apt to recur from time to time. Your opinion on the matter will be gratefully received.

RELIGIOUS.

II

REV. DEAR SIR,—Your comments in the current issue of the I. E. RECORD in answer to 'Administrator' on Mass Honoraria and local obligation seem to me to evade the chief issue. 'Administrator' cannot possibly say the Masses, and asks what are the executors bound to do. In your reply you say 'the Bishop has no power to dispense, if the donor had very special reasons for attaching the obligation to a particular church or altar.' But there can be no obligation unless the Mass Honoraria have been accepted. 'Administrator' does not accept and has no intention of doing so. What, then, are the executors bound to do ?

ANXIOUS.

Neither 'Administrator' nor the Superior of the Order is bound to accept the bequest or undertake the obligations it involves. Legacies are supposed to be favours rather than the opposite ; and it is one of the blessings of a free country, as well as one of the principles of Canon Law, that a man may, as a rule, renounce favours if he pleases. 'Anxious' wants attention directed to the 'main issue' ; but, in the query submitted by 'Administrator' in the last December number of the I. E. RECORD, the main issue was whether the *executors*, not the Administrator, were obliged to take any special steps. Even the executors might renounce the honour thrust on them, and then their obligations in regard to the Masses would, of course, come to an end. But we took it for granted, and still take it, that they were prepared to

carry out their functions. On that hypothesis, the query was whether they were obliged to consult the Bishop or not.

Even though some of the conditions prescribed in a will (e.g., celebration of Mass by a special priest) may be out of the question, others (celebration, for instance, in a special place) may still remain possible. It is the Church's wish that, in such cases, respect should be paid to such portions of the testator's wishes as are still practicable. If it can be shown, as suggested by 'Religious,' that a clause was inserted merely in order to comply with a legal formality, we may say that there was no real 'wish' on the testator's part, and that the regulations intended to protect the last 'wishes' of the deceased find no application. But suppose the opposite is true—that there *was* a real wish. Then we think that, if the numerous decisions given are to be upheld, the executors or heirs are not free to modify the clause at their discretion. They must appeal to ecclesiastical authority. And that authority will be lower or higher, and the trouble involved lesser or greater, in proportion to the motives that underlay the testator's final disposal of his property.

DECISIONS REGARDING MASS HONORARIA

ON the general question of the transference of Masses, it may be well to call attention to two recent decisions of the Congregation of the Council. The original documents may be found in the last January issue of the *I. E. RECORD*.¹ They throw a side-light on the methods adopted in various localities to meet the difficulties experienced in carrying out the letter of the law. But they indicate, at the same time, that these methods meet with little approval from the Roman authorities, and that the pertinent canons of the Code (824-44) constitute a rule that must be rigidly observed.

I

The first query was submitted by a Bishop whose name and address are not given. In his diocese, he stated, very many of the faithful were anxious to have Masses sung. They felt aggrieved if their offerings were refused or sent outside the diocese. To meet the case, the priests concerned, after securing the consent of the donors, adopted one or other of three courses :—

1°. Some of them sang one Solemn High Mass (*Missa solemnior*) in the parish church for all the intentions combined, and transferred the remaining Masses (with the usual diocesan honoraria) to externs, who undertook to say them for the same combined intentions. As the honorarium offered by the original donors was often much higher than the diocesan, the policy (as the Bishop remarked) was, from a financial point of view, very much to the advantage of the original donees.

2°. Others said one High Mass (*Missa solemnis*) as above—the honorarium being the usual one of the diocese for such functions—and devoted the remainder of the money to other 'good works.'

¹ Pages 76-8 and 101-3 respectively.

3°. Others did the same as those just mentioned, except that they substituted a *Missa Cantata* for the High Mass said by their stricter brethren.

None of the methods satisfied the Bishop's conscience. The first tended to develop avarice; the second and third meant the loss of many Masses and gave only a hazy idea of the 'good works' substituted: all three involved moral coercion of the donors, even though the latter did give consent. He was anxious, therefore, that the practices should be abolished, that as many Masses should be said as there were honoraria offered, and that, with the consent of the donors, an increased honorarium should be given to the externs, in view of the special obligation attaching to the Masses they accepted. To prepare the way for his reform, he submitted two queries:—

1°. 'Whether, with the consent of the donors, it is lawful to combine two or more intentions for sung Masses, so that one sung Mass may be celebrated for the combined intention in the donors' church, and the others transferred to externs—to be said for the same combined intention?' [The course followed by the first group of priests mentioned above.]

2°. Whether, with the consent of the donors, it is lawful so to combine two or more Masses, that only one Solemn Mass—for which the usual Solemn Mass honorarium is accepted—be sung for the composite intention, and the remainder of the offerings be devoted to 'pious works'? [The second course outlined above. The third is not mentioned.]

The Consultor, giving his view of the case, stated the five principles that should determine the solution:—

1°. No one should accept Mass-obligations which he is unable to fulfil within the due period and in the manner tacitly promised.

2°. As many Masses should be said as there are honoraria accepted (828).

3°. When manual Masses are transferred, the full honoraria must be transferred also, unless the donor expressly allows something to be retained, or unless it is quite certain that the larger honorarium was given for personal reasons (840).

4°. A honorarium higher than the diocesan may be accepted when freely offered (832).

5°. The donor may consent to a change in the agreement, provided he has full control over the honorarium offered—is not, for instance, as heir or executor, bound by a testator's wishes—and provided, when there is question of abolishing a right already acquired [as in the case of honoraria offered and accepted], his consent be absolutely free.

On these principles, the Consultor proceeded to draw a distinction between two classes of cases:—

1°. If the courses outlined are suggested to the donors *after* the honoraria have been accepted, we have clear proof that the first of the five principles has been violated. The priests accepted obligations that

they were unable to fulfil. Nor would the subsequent consent of the donors do much to improve the situation. It would be the result of moral compulsion—and moral compulsion, he adds, is utterly unlawful.

2°. If the suggestion, however, is made *before* the honoraria are accepted, some allowances may be made. It will still be unlawful to accept more than the diocesan law or custom allows in the case of a High Mass or *Missa Cantata*, for the offering is not made as freely as Canon 832 requires. But the substitution of 'good works' would seem to be allowable, provided the whole transaction is perfectly *bona fide* and the donor has full control.

Against some of the Consultor's statements a good few, we suspect, will feel inclined to register a protest. When, for instance, he lays down the general principle that 'moral compulsion is utterly unlawful' ('*proorsus illicita est*'), they will inquire whether moral compulsion is not the main-spring of many well-known and widespread movements that no theologian thinks of condemning off-hand. Without it, there would be very little driving power in strikes, trade-unionism, land leagues, campaigns against evil literature, international boycotts, and hundreds of other policies devised for the protection of the community. It is employed against individuals who, whatever their faults and failings, cannot be charged with any crime against strict justice and are in full possession of 'acquired rights.' It is not merely tolerated but, under definite conditions, warmly recommended by men of high moral principle, sound intelligence, and scrupulous conscience. A conclusion, therefore, based on the principle that 'moral compulsion is utterly unlawful' comes before us with a rather weak claim to recognition.

But, of course, the Consultor would reply that considerations of this kind do not affect the problem he had before him: that the conditions under which moral pressure is justifiable are not verified in the case of Mass honoraria freely accepted. In that he would be quite right. We are only drawing attention to the fact that some of his principles are stated incorrectly and, if rigidly applied, would lead to conclusions that he very probably rejects. Indeed, he seems not to take them very seriously himself; for, when he comes down to details, he says nothing of the distinction he has made, but answers simply:—

I. To the Bishop's first query, 'Yes, provided, 1°, the stipend assigned to the sung Mass be the normal one for such cases, increased (in case of special solemnity) to whatever amount law and custom sanction; 2°, the diocesan stipend be assigned to the Low Masses said in substitution; 3°, the surplus be restored to the donors.'

II. To the second query, 'Yes, if the donor has full control and freely consents, if the transaction is *bona fide*, and if there is no trafficking, real or apparent.'

He feels, however, that this will hardly satisfy the Bishop. His Lordship is not looking so much for a legal decision as for a practical remedy against possible abuses. So, after drawing attention to a certain vagueness in the Bishop's own proposal about the division of the honoraria, the Consultor traces the difficulty to the fact that too many

honoraria were accepted from a single donor. [There is no evidence of this in the published statement of the case; the trouble would be just as great if a single honorarium were received from each of too many donors. But perhaps the Consultor had more evidence than we have.] If such be the case, he proceeds, Canon 836 should be observed, only a small number of honoraria should be accepted from each, and the externs, to whom Masses are transferred, should either sing these Masses or say a number of Low Masses corresponding to the larger honorarium—unless the Holy See allows the substitution of other ‘good works’ instead.

Judging by its reply, we should say that the Congregation must have viewed the practices with even less favour than did the Consultor. There is no direct answer to either of the Bishop’s queries; nor is any view expressed on the conditions under which the Consultor would have allowed the customs to continue. The decision (given on the 9th July last) is simply ‘Ad mentem’; and the ‘mens’ is that the Ordinary take prudent steps to set aside the practice mentioned; and, in accordance with Canon 836 of the Code of Canon Law, let the faithful be told, in a notice posted in an open portion of the church, that, owing to the great number of sung Masses, some of these cannot be celebrated in the parochial church, and will be sent elsewhere for celebration. But we may be sure that during the transition period, while in spite of the Bishop’s efforts some traces of the old practice still continue, the Consultor’s views will be found useful in bringing these local customs into closer touch with the principles of justice and Canon Law.

The decision makes it clear:—

- 1°. That Canons 824–44 are to be strictly observed.
- 2°. That customs to the contrary—even when, as in this case, they can be defended, at least in a modified form, by an eminent canonist—are to be abolished as soon as prudence permits.
- 3°. That the substitution of ‘good works’ for Masses is not recommended. This is quite in the general spirit of the Code—as indicated for instance, in Canon 1551, § 3.

But the reply does not affect such practices as ‘November offerings.’ The faithful are well aware of the obligation undertaken. They intend their offerings as portion of the parochial revenue; and, even when transference takes place, the honorarium may follow the diocesan standard (cf. Canon 840, § 2).

II

The second decision has some bearing on the problem mentioned in the last paragraph, i.e., whether in certain circumstances the whole offering must be transferred, or only the diocesan honorarium. The case under consideration, though, was that of Novena and Gregorian Masses—the honorarium for which is *not* portion of the parochial revenue—and the reply, as we might expect, was in favour of the priests who actually say the Masses.

The Archbishop of Montevideo sent a statement to the Council:

'In this archdiocese of Montevideo (he said) there is a custom of having Novena and Gregorian Masses celebrated with a certain amount of external solemnity—and for these Masses the diocesan tax is greater than that appointed even now for simple Masses. A doubt then arises whether the total tax should be given to the celebrant, or whether portion of it may be retained in favour of the parish or church—the celebrant getting the ordinary Mass-stipend as defined at present. The reasons for the doubt are these: the parish priest assumes the obligation of having these Masses celebrated . . . and consequently is burdened with the task of finding priests and with the whole responsibility, particularly in the case of the Gregorian Masses—since, if, for instance, these are interrupted for any reason after a certain number, he must have them begin again at his own expense. Moreover, on not a few occasions, the faithful have these Masses said instead of a funeral Mass, and with special external solemnity.'

The Congregation takes up the reasons in order, only to reject them:—

1°. The parish priest has the task of finding celebrants. Yes; but the plea is too general and might be put forward by any rector. Any trouble involved is amply compensated for by the fact that the divine services are carried out so fully in his church. Anyhow, it is a trouble necessarily connected with his office.

2°. 'The rector transfers Masses at his own risk, and is bound in conscience if the series is interrupted.' Not so; the responsibility rests on the celebrant; he is bound not merely to say the Masses but to fulfil every condition specified (833).

3°. Nor does the fact that these Masses are occasionally substituted for a funeral Mass justify the conclusion that they must be governed in all respects by the regulations affecting the latter (e.g., by Canon 1237, § 2). When such a custom has become fairly well-established, the more advisable course would be to fix a special tax (in view of funeral rights or greater solemnity involved) and give the church or rector a right to it.

And the formal decision—given on the 16th April, but only published in November, 1921—was 'No,' with this 'ad mentem' addition: 'In the case of special solemnity in the celebration of the Masses, or when the latter take the place of a funeral Mass, let the Bishop fix a tax (not to be taken, though, from the Mass honoraria) by way of compensation for parish priests and rectors, and let the donors be so informed.'

M. J. O'DONNELL.

CANON LAW

CLERICS AND DANCING

REV. DEAR SIR,—A few months ago I read, in a local paper, an article dealing with a Roman decree, which forbade priests to organize, or be present at, dances, even though these dances were organized for religious or church purposes. The writer stated that this decree was given primarily for the American Church, but it was understood that it had world-wide application. Would you kindly let me know if such a decree exists, and, if so, does it apply to Ireland?

LEX.

There is such a decree: it was issued by the Consistorial Congregation in March, 1916.¹ The decree relates that, during the nineteenth century, the practice of having balls and social re-unions, confined exclusively to Catholics, grew up in the United States of America. The object of these gatherings was twofold: the promotion of a closer intimacy amongst Catholic families, and the provision of monetary aid for some pious or religious purpose; and they were not infrequently presided over by rectors of churches or parish priests. The practice, though its object was quite praiseworthy, gave rise to many abuses; so that the Fathers of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore were constrained to issue the following regulation: ‘Mandamus quoque ut sacerdotes illum abusum, quo convivia parantur cum choreis (balls) ad opera pia promovenda, omnino tollendum curent.’

In the course of time this statute was forgotten, and the practice of having these balls or dances for pious purposes was again introduced, and spread from the United States to Canada. Finally, the matter was brought to the notice of the Holy See, with the result that the Consistorial Congregation solemnly confirmed and re-imposed the canon of the Council of Baltimore, and, furthermore, directly forbade all clerics, secular and regular, to promote or encourage such dances, or to be present at them if they were got up by the laity.

Even before we received our correspondent's letter, we have more than once heard the view expressed that this decree was of universal application. The foundation of this position seems to be the general nature of the following passage in it:—

‘Eñi S. C. Consistorialis Patres: . . . decreverunt sacerdotes quoslibet sive saeculares sive regulares aliosque clericos prorsus prohiberi, quominus memoratas choreas promoveant et foveant, etiamsi in piorum operam levamen et subsidium, vel ad alium quemlibet pium finem; et

¹ *Acta Ap. Sedis*, May, 1916, pp. 147, 148.

insuper clericos omnes vetari, quominus hisce choreis intersint, si forte a laicis vivis promoveantur.'

Personally, we have no doubt that it applied, and does apply, only to the United States and Canada. This is evident in the first place from the title of the decree, '*Circa quaedam choreas in Statibus Foederatis Americae Septentrionalis et in Regione Canadensi.*' Again, the body of the decree, as is evident from the summary of it which we gave, is concerned entirely with balls and dances for pious purposes in these two countries; and, therefore, in the absence of any convincing evidence to the contrary, we must conclude that its dispositive portion is similarly restricted. Now, the passage quoted above does not afford evidence of this nature. It is evident that '*quoslibet sacerdotes sive saeculares sive regulares, aliosque clericos*' must be interpreted in the light of what has gone before, and hence must mean '*quoslibet sacerdotes, etc., in Statibus Foederatis Americae Septentrionalis et in Regione Canadensi.*' The same conclusion follows from the words '*memoratas choreas,*' which immediately follow. The only dances mentioned in the decree are those got up for pious purposes in the United States and Canada.

The decree, therefore, does not apply to Ireland; but, in view of the vogue which dances for pious purposes have recently had in this country, it may be well to see exactly what is our legal position in this matter. Well, it is determined by the general law and by the statutes of the Maynooth Synod. The former forbids clerics to be present at dances, if they are unbecoming the ecclesiastical state, or if the presence of ecclesiastics would be a source of scandal. The latter constitute the more important legislation from the viewpoint of the present discussion: we shall, therefore, quote the three statutes which bear on this point:—

'179. *Choreas et saltationes tam publicas quam privatas clerici omnino fugiant, nec eas instituant, nec ullo modo promoveant.*

'320. *Omnibus sacerdotibus tam saecularibus quam regularibus qui in ministerio animarum versantur injungimus ut saltationes modestiae Christianae repugnantes pro viribus impediant. Et sciant confessarii se suo muneri non satisfacere, si ullo modo, aut sub ullo praetextu, eas permittant aut excusent.*

'321. *Ne permittant clerici saltationes in ullo aedificio sub eorum tutela posito ubi potus immoderate distribuitur, vel ubi, senioribus absentibus, utriusque sexus juvenes congregantur.'*

Statute 179 has been interpreted as applying only to improper dances,¹ though personally we are inclined to think that it has a wider scope. Granting, however, the correctness of this interpretation, still the prohibition which it contains will certainly cover the kinds of dances mentioned in Statutes 320 and 321. Hence clerics are forbidden to promote in any way whatever dances and balls which are opposed to Christian modesty; and such opposition, it is scarcely necessary to remark, may arise, not merely from the nature of the dance itself and

¹ I. E. RECORD, July, 1910, Fourth Series, vol. xxvii., pp. 64-71.

the motions which it involves, but also from the character of the dress worn by the dancers. A similar prohibition exists in the case of dances in which intoxicating drink is too freely distributed, or in which only young people of both sexes are present without any supervision on the part of their elders. Needless to say, too, these prohibitions hold, even when the dances or balls are got up for pious or religious purposes; in fact, this circumstance, it seems to us, makes the obligation more serious: it is really a prostitution of religion to promote it by means of this kind.

THE RIGHT OF A PRIEST TO REMAIN IN THE DIOCESE IN WHICH HE IS INCARDINATED

REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you kindly give a solution to the following case in the I. E. RECORD:—

Father M. was ordained for the diocese of B, in a country subject to the Propaganda. Being unhappy there, his Ordinary allowed him to return home, and seek another diocese. Finding this impossible, and now being in a chastened frame of mind, he desires to return to his own diocese. His Ordinary is so opposed to this, that he is ready to go to the limit of official refusal to readmit him. Father M. has not been guilty of any crime or scandal. He simply found it difficult to adapt himself to circumstances. He has never been excommunicated, and is now willing 'to settle down' and 'carry on' in the diocese for which he was ordained. Can the Ordinary really refuse to re-admit him? If so, what claims has he for support from the Ordinary?

SACERDOS.

We presume, when our correspondent asks whether the Ordinary is bound to readmit this priest to the diocese, he means re-admission which involves the concession of a curacy or some other position of a similar nature. Our answer is that the Ordinary is obliged to readmit him. In accordance with the facts, as related in this query, the priest is still incardinated in this diocese, for which he has been ordained on missionary title, and he is not labouring under any impediments, moral or physical, which would prevent him from exercising the sacred ministry. Now, Canon 981, § 2, declares that the Ordinary is bound to confer on a priest who is ordained on the missionary title a benefice, office, or subsidy, which would be sufficient for his decent maintenance. Although this canon does not say so, it is clear, however, that the primary obligation of the Ordinary is to confer the benefice or office, and thus enable the cleric to maintain himself through his ministerial labours; and that only when this primary duty, for one reason or another, becomes impossible, are the requirements of the missionary title sufficiently complied with by a grant of financial assistance. Such was the old teaching on this matter, and, in the absence of any decisive

indication to the contrary, the Code must be similarly interpreted. To illustrate this it will suffice to quote the following passage from an Instruction published by the Propaganda in 1871: 'Those who are ordained on such a title obtain what is necessary for their maintenance from the Apostolic ministry in the mission to which they are attached.'

The same conclusion follows from a consideration of the oath which those ordained on the missionary title are obliged to take before the reception of major Orders. A quotation from it will make this abundantly clear :—

'Voveo pariter et juro quod in hac Diocesi aut Vicariata, vel in Missionem cui S. Sedi vel Congregationi de Propaganda Fide me destinare placuerit, perpetuo in divinis administrandis laborem meum ac operam, sub omnimoda directione et jurisdictione R.P.D. pro tempore Ordinarii, pro salute animarum impendam.'

Now, such an oath would be illusory unless there were a corresponding obligation on the part of the Ordinary to provide a field for the labours of the missionary. Even the words themselves contain a fairly clear insinuation as to the existence of this obligation. The candidate for Orders swears to labour for the salvation of souls under the direction and jurisdiction of the Ordinary. It seems to be presupposed, therefore, that the Ordinary is to provide the missionary with a position involving the care of souls, and to direct and regulate his activities in the exercise of the sacred ministry.

NEW DECREES

I

DECLARATION REGARDING THE REVISION OF THE CONSTITUTIONS OF RELIGIOUS INSTITUTES

The issue of the *Acta Apostolicæ Sedis*, published on the 23rd November, contains two important Instructions from the Congregation of Religious. The first has reference to the revision of the constitutions of religious institutes. Canon 489, it will be remembered, states that: 'The rules and particular constitutions of each Institute not opposed to the canons of the Code retain their force, while those opposed to these canons are abrogated.' The natural conclusion from this regulation was that the text of the rules and constitutions should be corrected in accordance with the requirements of the new legislation. This obligation was formally imposed by a decree of the Congregation of Religious, published in the *Acta Apostolicæ Sedis* of July, 1918, which prescribed, furthermore, that the corrected text should be submitted to the Congregation for revision and approval. The present Instruction points out that several obstacles have prevented the Congregation from expeditiously carrying out this revision. In addition to the fact that an examination of the immense number of constitutions submitted would require, even under the most favourable conditions, a very considerable

time, it has not infrequently happened that the text sent to the Congregation did not fulfil the conditions requisite in order that approval might be given. Hence the following instructions are given to the heads of religious institutes for their guidance in this matter :—

I. Only constitutions or statutes the text of which has been approved by the Holy See should be sent to the Sacred Congregation.

II. The task of correcting the text conformably to the Code devolves on the Order, Institute, or monastery, and two copies of the corrected text should be sent to the Sacred Congregation.

III. The text should be corrected only in these things in which the constitutions are opposed to the Code, or additions should be made when necessary, and in both cases the words of the Code should be used as far as possible.

IV. If, on the occasion of this revision, any Institute wishes to introduce into its constitutions changes not required by the Code, these should not be embodied in the corrected text, but the necessary permission should be sought from the Sacred Congregation by a separate petition, in which the text already approved and the proposed text should be given in full, together with the reasons for the changes. The petition will not be accepted unless the changes have been discussed and approved in a General Chapter. If, however, there is question only of minor points, or of the substitution of words, or of abrogating usages which have passed into desuetude on account of the changed circumstances or some similar reason, the consent of the General Council is sufficient.

V. Least differences should arise in the text of constitutions used by different independent houses or monasteries of the same Order or Institute, the Sacred Congregation ordains that one and the same corrected text must be accepted by all the houses, and that the task of its preparation must be undertaken either by the houses themselves or by the Sacred Congregation.

These regulations are so clear that they need very little comment. The last one, n. 5, throws light on a point which was hitherto rather obscure, and is of much importance for many of our religious Institutes of women in this country. In unorganized Congregations, such as the Presentation and Mercy Sisters, it was not at all clear upon whom devolved the duty of making the prescribed corrections. In accordance with this regulation two alternative courses are possible: the corrected text may be prepared by all the houses acting conjointly—the mother-house, we presume, taking the initiative, or the work of correction may be left entirely to the Sacred Congregation itself.

II

INSTRUCTION REGARDING THE SECOND YEAR'S NOVIATE

The Code prescribes only one year's noviciate, and all its regulations regarding the manner in which the noviciate is to be spent have reference to this year. It recognizes, of course, that a further period may be

required by the constitutions of individual Institutes, but [the only statement made by the Code in regard to it is that it is not necessary for validity unless the constitutions expressly state the contrary.

The object of the present Instruction is to legislate on this second year's noviciate necessary in some Institutes, and, by preventing novices from being too engrossed in the works of their Institute, thus secure the attainment of the primary end for which this probationary time is intended. We shall give its dispositive portion substantially:—

I. The first article is general in its form. It states that, when the constitutions prescribe a second year's noviceship, and during it permit the novices to engage in the works proper to the Institute, this is lawful, provided the fundamental laws of the noviciate are not interfered with. Accordingly, it should be always remembered that the noviciate was instituted to form the minds of the novices in those matters which have reference to the extirpation of vices, to the repression of the motions of the mind, and to the acquisition of a knowledge of the regular life by a study of the constitutions; in order that thus they might learn how to tend to Christian perfection through the profession of the evangelical counsels and the vows, which precisely constitutes the purpose of every Institute. The second year's noviciate, it is pointed out, is usually prescribed in Institutes engaged in external works, because their members require a more solid foundation in the religious life on account of the worldly distractions to which they are necessarily subjected.

II. It is lawful, therefore, for a novice to engage in the works of the Institute, if the constitutions permit it—it is quite clear from the Instruction that this is true, even in regard to external works. Prudence and moderation should, however, be observed in this matter, and the only object in view should be the instruction of the novices. They should never so engage in these works as to take sole charge themselves, for example, by supplying for an absent teacher, or by ministering to the sick in a hospital, but should be always under the direction and vigilance of a grave religious, who would teach them by word and lead them by example.

III. Whenever the constitutions permit a novice to be sent, during the second year's noviciate, to works outside the noviciate house, this should take place only in exceptional cases and for a grave cause. This cause must have reference to the novices, inasmuch, namely, as they cannot be sufficiently instructed in the noviciate house, or for some other reason cannot remain there; the necessity or utility of the Institute, for example, the substitution of novices for religious through a scarcity of the latter in the works of the Institute, can never, under any pretext whatever, be a sufficient cause.

IV. Whether the novices have been in the noviciate house or outside of it, for two months before profession, they should give up all external work, and, if they have been outside the noviciate house, they should be recalled to it, in order that for the entire two months they should

confirm themselves in the spirit of their vocation and prepare themselves for making their profession.

These substantially are the regulations regarding the second year's noviciate. Perhaps it is as well to quote Canon 565, which contains those which govern the training and formation of novices during the first year's noviciate, and thus make it possible to see at a glance the differences between the two :—

' § 1. The year of the noviciate . . . must have for object the forming of the mind of the novice by means of study of the rule and constitutions, by pious meditation and assiduous prayer, by instruction on those matters which pertain to the vows and the virtues, by suitable exercises in rooting out the germs of vice, in regulating the motions of the soul, in acquiring virtues.

' § 2. The lay novices are, besides, to be carefully instructed in Christian Doctrine, and to this end a special conference should be given them, at least once a week.

' § 3. During the year of noviciate the novices must not be employed in preaching, or hearing confessions, or in the external charges of the Institute, or even in the study of letters, the sciences, or arts ; the lay-novices, however, may perform within the religious house itself all the duties of lay-members (but in a subordinate capacity) in so far only as such duties do not prevent them from taking part in the exercises prescribed for them in the noviciate.'

The main difference, therefore, between the first and the second year's noviciate is that during the former the novices may not engage in the external works of the Institute, whereas during the latter they may. External works are distinguished from internal. By the latter are meant those whose primary object is the spiritual formation and sanctification of the individual ; if the primary object is something other than this, for example, the instruction of others, the relief of poverty, the care of the sick, then the works are external. The Instruction, however, permits novices to engage in external occupations only under certain restrictions, namely, with prudence and moderation, in a subordinate capacity, and in case novices are required to go outside the noviciate house, only in exceptional cases and for a grave cause.

It is interesting to note that the prescriptions of the *Normae* regarding the second year's noviciate are in substantial agreement with those of the present Instruction, as will be evident from the following quotation : ' In the second year of the noviciate they may engage with moderation in study and other works of the Institute, always under the direction and vigilance of the Mistress ; but in the noviciate house, not outside of it, unless for grave reasons the contrary is deemed advisable.'

J. KINANE.

LITURGY

QUERIES REGARDING THE 'ORATIO IMPERATA' IN THE
MASS. COMMEMORATIONS IN A VOTIVE MASS. THE
NEW RUBRIC *RE* THE RECITATION OF THE SEQUENCE

REV. DEAR SIR,—Will you kindly answer the following queries in the next issue of the I. E. RECORD :—

1. We have in this diocese an 'oratio imperata' *de Spiritu Sancto*—what about the third Prayer in a Votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin, and in those Masses in which the Prayer is already prescribed? Must the 'oratio imperata' be taken notice of in those cases?

2. When the third Prayer of the Mass on a Simple or Semi-double Feast is *ad libitum*, should the 'oratio imperata' come before or after it, or may the Prayer *ad libitum* be altogether omitted in such a case?

3. Suppose a priest is saying a Votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin on a Semi-double on which there are commemorations of other Simple or Semi-double Feasts, does he make a commemoration of those Feasts in the Votive Mass?

4. Is it true that the recitation of the special Sequences is now obligatory only in sung Masses?

If space does not permit, a reply of 'yes' or 'no' to each question will be sufficient for me.

SACERDOS.

It would not be difficult to give categorical replies of 'yes' or 'no' to the queries of our esteemed correspondent, but we think they raise so many points of interest, more especially in connexion with the saying or omission of the 'oratio imperata' that we gladly give the space necessary for a more detailed reply. Moreover, we find that the new Missal contains certain changes in the rules regulating the insertion of this Prayer in the Mass, so that a brief discussion of the whole subject at this stage may be both useful and opportune.

I. *A general notion of the Prayer.*—The 'oratio imperata' may be defined as a Collect of the Mass prescribed by the Ordinary for some reasonable cause. It has no relation to the Office of the day, and is prescribed, not by the rubrics but by the special order of the Bishop. The cause may be a necessity of the Universal Church, of the diocese or of some considerable portion of it, either to obtain a special favour, e.g., the grace of the Holy Spirit during the time of an Ecumenical Council, or pending the election of a Bishop, fine weather or rain at certain seasons, peace among nations, etc., or to avert an actual or impending evil, e.g., a plague, war, persecution of the Church, etc., or

again the Prayer may be '*pro defunctis*.' The Pope is alone competent to order such a Prayer for the Universal Church, the Ordinary for his own diocese; no others¹ are entitled to prescribe an '*oratio imperata*' in the Mass. The rubric of the new Missal directs that not more than two such Prayers shall be prescribed by the Ordinary at the same time, and the obligation thereof extends to all priests, secular and religious, celebrating Mass within the limits of his jurisdiction. *Peregrini*, therefore, are to recite the '*oratio imperata*' of the diocese in which they celebrate, not that of the diocese to which they belong, and even exempt Religious celebrating in their own churches are not excused from the binding force of the obligation.² The duration of this obligation depends upon the expressed will of the Ordinary. If the mandate prescribes a definite time-limit or contains such words as '*until further notice*,' there is no difficulty; it is only when the time is left indefinite, e.g., a prayer for rain or fine weather, for peace amongst nations, that doubts arise as to the continuance of the obligation. In these circumstances, the priest must use his own discretion as to whether the cause accounting for the obligation has ceased to exist or not. The death or transference of the Ordinary does not affect the '*oratio imperata*,' just as it does not affect other general laws made for the community—except in the unusual case when the Prayer is ordered '*ad beneplacitum nostrum*,' or in some equivalent terms.

II. *When the 'oratio imperata' is to be said and when omitted.*—The answer to these points will depend very much on the nature of the mandate given by the Ordinary. We have stated already that the Prayer may be either *pro vivis* or *pro defunctis*, a distinction easily discernible in the mandate itself. Again, (1) sometimes the Prayer is ordered for a special purpose without any qualifying clauses ('*ordinario modo*'), (2) sometimes the gravity of the cause is indicated and the Prayer is prescribed '*pro re gravi*,' and (3) sometimes '*pro re gravi etiam in Duplicibus 1 classis*.' To ascertain when the '*oratio imperata*' should be said and when omitted, it is necessary to keep these distinctions in mind, and to carefully examine the Bishop's mandate prescribing the Prayer. Prescinding for the moment from the rather exceptional case when the Prayer is prescribed '*pro defunctis*,' the following are the rules for the saying or omission of the '*oratio imperata*.' (A.) When the Prayer is prescribed '*ordinario modo*,' it should be recited in all Masses, whether read or sung, except: (1) in Requiem Masses; (2) on Doubles of 1st and 2nd Class; (3) on Major Sundays; (4) on privileged Feriars, Vigils, and Octaves; (5) in Solemn Votive Masses '*pro re gravi et publica simul causa vel ad instar solemniū celebratis*'; (6) whenever in the Mass there are already four

¹ Regular Prelates and Superiors have, according to the New Missal, a right to select for their subjects the third Prayer of the Mass when it happens to be *ad libitum*: '*Si autem Oratio ad libitum praeferatur in Missis cantatis et conventualibus eligitur ad libitum Praefecti Capituli vel Superioris Communitatis*.' But this is not an '*oratio imperata*' in the technical sense.

² Decr. 2163.

Prayers prescribed by the rubrics. (B.) When it is prescribed simply 'pro re gravi,' it should be recited in all Masses except: (1) in Requiem Masses; (2) on Doubles of 1st Class; (3) on the Vigils of Nativity and Pentecost; (4) on Palm Sunday. (C.) When it is prescribed 'pro re gravi etiam in Duplicibus 1 classis,' it should be recited in all Masses, except: (1) in Requiem Masses; (2) on Festivals of the Nativity, Epiphany, Resurrection, Ascension, Pentecost, Corpus Christi, and the Trinity; (3) during the Triduum of Holy Week.

In this connexion, the following points are to be noted: (1) If the Prayer is prescribed 'ordinario modo,' it is no longer optional to say it on a Double of 2nd Class; (2) if it is ordered 'pro re gravi,' it is not to be omitted because there are already four Prayers prescribed by the rubrics;¹ (3) a second 'oratio imperata' (if two are prescribed at the same time) is not to be omitted because the insertion of the first makes four Prayers in the Mass.

III. *The order and place of the 'oratio imperata' in the Mass.*—The rubric of the new Missal is that the 'oratio imperata' should be recited after the Prayers prescribed by the rubrics, or in place of the third Prayer whenever it happens to be *ad libitum*. It is said, therefore, after the special or common Commemorations demanded by the rubrics and before the strictly Votive Prayers which, in certain Masses, may be added at the option of the celebrant. The Prayer is *never* recited under one conclusion² with the principal Prayer of the Mass—not even on Doubles of the 1st Class—nor is it repeated³ if already the same Prayer has been said in fulfilment of the rubrics of the Mass. As to the *order* of recitation when two such 'orationes' are prescribed at the same time, the first should be the one 'pro re gravi,' the second 'modo ordinario'; if both are 'pro re gravi' the first is 'pro re gravi etiam in Duplicibus 1 classis,' the second 'pro re gravi simpliciter'; if both are ordered in the same way either 'ordinario modo' or 'pro re gravi,' they are to be recited in the order in which they occur in the Missal.

IV. *When the Prayer is prescribed 'pro defunctis.'*—While it was always held⁴ that the Ordinary could prescribe such a Prayer, the rules regulating the exercise of the power are now for the first time incorporated in the rubrics of the Missal. According to the rubric the Prayer is to be said both in Masses 'pro defunctis' and 'pro vivis,' within certain well-defined limits. The 'oratio imperata' is never said in Requiem Masses which admit only one Prayer. In the 'Missa Quotidiana' it is recited in the third place, the Prayer 'Fidelium' always coming last, and other Prayers according to the option of the priest being inserted between the 'oratio imperata' and the 'Fidelium.'

¹ Decr. S.R.C., March 22, 1912.

² Rubric of the New Missal.

³ If the 'oratio imperata' happens to be one of the two prayers 'Ecclesiae vel pro Papa,' and one of these Prayers is already prescribed by the rubrics of the Mass, the recitation of one of the Prayers will fulfil the double precept. Cf. Rubrics of the New Missal.

⁴ Decr. 1322.

In Masses 'pro vivis' of less than Semi-double rite, the Prayer should be inserted as the last but one ('penultimo loco') among *all*¹ the Prayers read in the Mass. The Prayer is not recited (1) in Ferial and Simple Feast Masses during Paschal time, nor (2) whenever a Double or Semi-double Feast is commemorated.

We may now address ourselves to the queries of our correspondent.

1. The 'oratio imperata' is not said in such cases. The rule—'eodem bis non fit in eadem missa'—does not admit exceptions.

2. The rubric of the New Missal clearly states that whenever the third Prayer of the Mass is *ad libitum*, its place is taken by the 'oratio imperata,' and no additional Prayer is necessary to make the requisite number of three in Masses of less than Double rite.

3. Yes; all the special commemorations prescribed for the Mass of the day are to be added in the Votive Mass. The order is as follows: (1st) The Prayer of the Votive Mass; (2nd) the Prayer of the Mass of the day; (3rd) 1st Commemoration of the Mass of the day; (4th) the 2nd Commemoration of the Mass of the day, and so on. The Common Commemorations, viz., those ordered for the Season ('pro diversitate temporum') need not be added, provided that without them there are already three Prayers for the Votive Mass.

4. The following is the rubric of the New Missal regulating the recitation of the Sequences: 'Sequentia, quae aliquibus assignatur Festis, addenda est etiam in Missis in cantu et conventualibus, quae de Octava eorundem Festorum dicantur; in Missis autem privatis lectis de die infra Octavam, non autem die Octava, diei vel omitti potest ad libitum celebrantis. Excipiuntur tamen Octavae Paschatis et Pentecostes, in quibus Sequentia semper dicitur.' In the Missal there are in all five Sequences, viz., (1) *Dies Irae*, (2) *Victimae Paschali* (Easter), (3) *Veni Sancte Spiritus* (Pentecost), (4) *Lauda Sion* (Corpus Christi), (5) *Stabat Mater*. Of these the *Dies Irae* is regulated by a special rubric; it is recited in all sung Requiem Masses, and in all read Masses which have only one Prayer, and it may or may not be recited in other Requiem Masses. The Sequences for Easter and Pentecost are, according to the rubric, to be recited throughout their respective Octaves, whether the Mass is read or sung. Other Sequences, viz., *Lauda Sion* and *Stabat Mater* (Feast of Seven Dolours), are obligatory on the day of the Feast and on the Octave day, and in all sung and conventual Masses of days within the Octave; in private Masses within the Octave they are optional. As the Feast of the Seven Dolours has not an Octave in the General Calendar, the practical change effected by the new rubric concerns only the Sequence *Lauda Sion* for Corpus Christi. Henceforth in private Masses (not sung or conventual) on days within the Octave of the Feast—not, however, the Octave day—the priest is at liberty to say or omit the Sequence *Lauda Sion*.

¹ If, therefore, two 'orationes imperatae' are read, one 'pro defunctis,' the other 'pro vivis,' and no additional Prayers are inserted at the option of the celebrant, the Prayer 'pro defunctis' takes precedence of the Prayer 'pro vivis,' even though the latter is prescribed 'pro re gravi.' Cf. Rubrics of Missal.

APPROVAL OF NEW MASSES AND OFFICES

WE published in the last issue¹ a document from the Sacred Congregation of Rites which clearly indicates that the stability we had anticipated for our new Breviaries and Missals was of short duration. Four new Offices have to be inserted in our Breviaries, and four Masses are to be drawn from the Appendix into the body of the Missal to take their place with the other Masses of the General Calendar of the Church. The obligation in regard to these Masses and Offices starts with the current year, but the power is given to Ordinaries and major Superiors of religious Orders (for their own subjects) to defer the obligation to the year 1923, if they deem it expedient. As the four Masses now ordered for the Universal Church are already contained in all our Missals in the section 'pro aliquibus locis,' their recitation will give rise to very little inconvenience, but the section 'pro aliquibus locis' is no longer in our Breviaries, and consequently the new Offices will have to be secured either separately or as incorporated in future editions of the Breviary. The four new Masses and Offices are as follows: (1) The Feast of the Holy Family, assigned to the Sunday within the Octave of the Epiphany. In the old Missals (Appendix 'pro aliquibus locis') it was assigned to the third Sunday after Epiphany and in the newest editions it is given on January 19th. We notice a slight change in the Epistle of this Mass as given in the New Missal. Formerly it commenced: 'Induite vos ergo sicut,' etc.; now it is, 'Fratres: induite vos sicut,' etc. (2) The Feast of St. Gabriel Archangel, assigned to March 24th. In the older Missals it was assigned to March 18th. (3) The Feast of St. Ireneus, assigned to June 28th. In the old and in the newest editions of the Missal it is given on July 4th. To make room for it on June 28th, the Feast of St. Leo is now permanently transferred to July 3rd. (4) The Feast of St. Raphael Archangel assigned to October 24th. Three of the Feasts, viz., (1), (2), (4) are given the dignity of double major rite and the other that of a simple double, and the Feast of the Holy Family gets the additional privilege peculiar to Feasts of Our Lord (of double rite) of superseding the Sunday's Office and Mass.

Another document, which we publish in this issue,² announces the official approval of a new Mass and Office of *The Most Sacred Eucharistic Heart of Jesus* for the Thursday following the Octave of Corpus Christi. The special object of this new Feast is, as the decree indicates, to commemorate the love of our Divine Lord as shown in the Holy Eucharist and to excite in the hearts of the faithful a greater confidence and love in approaching the Sacred Mystery. The Feast has been already established in Rome, and the privilege of celebrating it as a Feast of double major rite will be granted to any other diocese that asks for it.

M. EATON.

¹ I. E. RECORD, January, p. 106.

² See p. 209 *infra*.

CORRESPONDENCE

FUNERAL OFFERINGS

REV. DEAR SIR,—So much has been written on the question of Funeral Offerings in the Province of Armagh, one feels that the patience, if not of your readers, at least of the distinguished Canonist, must be well nigh exhausted. On this account I feel I owe an apology—all the more as many like myself are not thoroughly satisfied with the solution—for offering some further remarks which, if they fail to invite a reconsideration of conclusions arrived at, might, at least, suggest to our legislators the advisability, at the opportune time, of recasting the law in a way that would be less open to cavil and less prejudicial, perhaps, to what might be called ‘vested interests.’

In the meantime, may it not be fairly contended that the man who, after a seven months’ residence, dies in an hospital—in his own parish—may also be regarded as dying outside his parish, and therefore as supplying a case for some kind of division of the *oblata* as contemplated in the Armagh Statute? Such a contention appears reasonable, if we suppose the patient has had elsewhere a domicile, around which all his interests and belongings are centred, and where, too, as usually happens, his funeral rites are performed. It scarcely needed the words of Canon 1216, 2: ‘Si defunctus habuerit plures parochias proprias, etc.,’ to inform us that even a dead man may have had more parishes as his very own, and since he can only die in one of them, it follows, as a matter of course, that he dies outside the others.

Were it a matter not of death but of a marriage ceremony, no one would question the right of the hospital patient to return to the parish of his domicile nor the liceity of the action of its incumbent—*observatis observandis*—to assist at the ceremony and to receive the emoluments accruing. It may be said that Canon Law makes special provision for a case of the kind, and, furthermore, that we are here face to face with a man who, by his own deliberate act, an act of which the dead person is incapable, renews his relations with his former pastor; but is it not equally clear, having regard to Canons 1225–1226, that even a dead man may, within certain limits, by a previous act designate the church of *funeralia* with all that it implies? Personally, I would not be disposed to base a claim, or entertain one, if made, on this provision of the general law, as long as the Statute of Armagh was applicable, but I would be interested to know what is to be thought of one who, by reason of the previous election of deceased, and without any further title except possession takes his stand on the general law in the distribution of the *oblata*, and this even though, to some extent at least, the Armagh Statute seems to apply.

I may say, however, although I can hardly hope to secure your approval, that the plea of ‘Mullaghduff,’ which appeared in a former

issue—a plea based on the real or presumed intention of the Armagh legislators—has always appealed to me, so much so, indeed, that although until quite recently I had a workhouse hospital in my parish, and although I was fully aware of the new facilities for acquiring a quasi-domicile, it never occurred to me to make any further claim on my neighbours than such as the fact of death in my parish entitled me to make. My personal action as an example for others counts for nothing, but if I were to assign a reason for it, I should say that a strong sense of equity—having regard to the intentions of the donors ; to the circumstances under which offerings are given ; circumstances so well known to one like myself living in an offering district—compelled me to think that the words of the Statute, in their original limited sense, supplied a much more equitable basis for adjusting conflicting claims than they would supply if they were invested with the extension they receive under the Code. I fully, indeed, appreciate your reply to ‘Mullaghduff,’ which says, in effect, that in interpreting a law the intention of the legislator may then only be taken account of, when the words of the law are doubtful. The words of the present law, so far from being doubtful, have a well-defined meaning. But, then, is not the case very much out of the common ? The words of the law were not doubtful before the publication of the Code ; they are not doubtful now, unless and in so far as *epikeia* may restrict their application in the circumstances. The fact, however, remains, that they have been changed in their comprehensiveness by the publication of the Code, and if, as appears to be the case, they were designed in their original setting to crystallize the intention of the legislators, and in their then limited meaning to supply the most satisfactory basis of adjustment, is it imperative—and this in a pre-existing Statute—that they should be toned up in practice to present-day extension, when such a toning up would defeat, to some extent at least, the intention of the legislators and open the way to less equitable arrangements which it was their purpose to guard against ?

It would be very convenient, indeed, and the right thing as well, if the word *paroecia*, wherever it occurs, would be read with the same meaning, but it would be equally convenient if, and when, it occurs in a law antecedent to the Code, where its then limited connotation supplied a proper basis of equity, some new formula were adopted, which whilst leaving a stereotyped word of the kind its strict legal sense, would make for the basis of equity, which *paroecia* in its original sense secured. We await the formula in the opportune time, but meanwhile is there any provision of law, unknown to rural canonists like myself, which compels us, in the circumstances, to read the *paroecia* of the Statute with the brand of extension which it is supposed to derive from the Codex ?

In penning these remarks I have had in my mind another consideration to which, however, I give expression with the greatest diffidence. Canon 1234 directs Bishops to make regulations regarding *funeralia*, and although the specific words do not occur here, or elsewhere, as far as I know, I take it that the charter is general enough to embrace funeral offerings, as they are known amongst us. The

directions, so far from binding them to follow on the lines of common law, would appear wide enough to enable them to make regulations in contravention of it, and with such ample powers of self-determination, would it be too much to claim that technical terms used by them, and excluding by their very meaning a certain class of cases, should continue to be interpreted in their original sense, until the authorities responsible had declared their views on the matter, or until they had provided a formula which, whilst respecting the newly extended meaning of their terminology, would also register their views as already expressed.

There is just one other point which occurs to me. In the very same Canon, 1234, I notice that custom gets a big show, and if custom, which may be *praeter* or even *contra legem*, apparently counts for so much as a determining factor, would it not appear fair to assume that a traditional interpretation based on the words of the law, until expressly set aside, should get at least an equal place of honour with a custom of, perhaps, doubtful antecedents.

I, for one, am satisfied that when our legislators meet again, if account is to be taken of the new facilities for acquiring a parish, the wording of the present law will undergo a drastic change, and it might even be a question whether a repetition of it in the same words, with their new meaning, might not, as being against the common good, be *ultra vires*. This is a bold assertion, but I hope to make it good. When our legislators take up this matter afresh their purpose will be to provide a basis of equity, but in doing so they will not lose sight of the public good, and they will be careful not to do anything which would be a menace to the very existence of funeral offerings as a stable and, in many districts, a very necessary means of support for the clergy. I am convinced that legislation proceeding on certain lines would be such a menace. Take the typical case. A dies in parish B, after seven months' residence in hospital. The remains are brought home to parish C, the parish of domicile, of friends and relatives who pay the last tribute of respect by their presence and offerings on the occasion. The pastor of parish C is quite of the ordinary type; he feels it rather hard that offerings contributed mainly by his own parishioners, intended, no doubt primarily, as a mark of respect to the deceased, but intended also for his own maintenance, must be forwarded by the very next post to the pastor of parish B. The parishioners, immediately they become aware of it, look at the matter from a somewhat different standpoint, and they make no secret of their intentions that such a thing will not occur again. The result is as might be anticipated. Next time, in similar circumstances, they will be there to pay their respect, but as they are under no obligation to pastor B, who may be even quite unknown to them, they will pay their respect minus their offerings. And this is not a fanciful case. It is one of those that will occur, and occur much more frequently in the days of concentrated hospitals and county homes, with the result that a severe blow will be gradually dealt to one of the time-honoured institutions which our people make use of, without any special inconvenience, to maintain their priests 'in modo honesto et descenti.'

ALTER DUBIUS.

DOCUMENTS

A PROPER MASS AND OFFICE OF 'THE MOST SACRED EUCHARISTIC HEART OF JESUS' FOR THE THURSDAY FOLLOWING THE OCTAVE OF CORPUS CHRISTI ARE APPROVED BY THE SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES

(November 9, 1921)

S. CONGREGATIO RITUUM.

ROMANA

PRO FERIA V POST OCTAVAM SS^{MI} CORPORIS CHRISTI, SACRATISSIMI CORDIS IESU EUCHARISTICI OFFICIUM PROPRIUM CUM RESPONDENTE MISSA APPROBATUR

DECRETUM

Instantibus compluribus Rev^mis Ordinariis dioecesium, Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Benedictus Papa XV, referente infrascripto Cardinali Sacrae Rituum Congregationi Praefecto, Officium proprium cum respondente Missa *Sacratissimi Cordis Iesu Eucharistici* exhibitum et ab ipsa Sacra Congregatione revisum, prouti in separato prostat exemplari, approbare dignatus est, illudque feria V post octavam Ss^{mi} Corporis Christi adhibendum decrevit.

Peculiaris ratio et finis huius Festi cum Officio et Missa propriis, ad commemorandum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi amorem in Eucharistiae mysterio, enucleatius explicatur in Sacris Litteris et in operibus sanctorum Ecclesiae Patrum ac Doctorum, atque etiam innuitur in illa pia, usitata et a Summo Pontifice Pio VII probate oratione: *Ecco fin dove è giunta*, etc.¹—Insimul in iteratis supplicantium precibus ipsiusque Beatissimi Patris votis alter finis est, mediante hoc Festo, magis excitare in christifidelium animis fiduciam et accessum in Sanctissimae Eucharistiae mysterium, eorumque corda ferventius inflammare igne divini amoris quo Dominus Noster Iesus Christus, infinita caritate in Corde suo flagrans, sanctissimam Eucharistiam instituit, suosque discipulos in eodem sacratissimo Corde suo custodit ac diligit, vivens et manens in eis sicut ipsi vivunt et manent in illo, qui in eiusdem sanctissimae Eucharistiae mysterio se nobis offert ac donat, victimam, socium, cibum, viaticum et futurae gloriae pignus.

Hoc autem Festum eadem Sanctitas Sua clero saeculari huius Almae

¹ *Raccolta di orazioni e pie opere per le quali sono state concesse dai Sommi Pontefici le sante indulgenze*, Roma, 1898, p. 106, n. 73.

Urbis et singulis dioecesis petentibus, sub ritu duplici maiori benigne concessit, servatis de cetero Rubricis atque Apostolicae Sedis decretis. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus. Die 9 novembris 1921.

✠ A. CARD. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,
S. R. C. Praefectus.

ALEXANDER VERDE, *Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS TO THE HIERARCHY OF CZECHOSLOVACHIA EXHORTING THEM TO TAKE COUNSEL FOR THE PROPER EDUCATION AND DISCIPLINE OF THE CLERGY

(November 30, 1921)

EPISTOLA

AD RR. PP. DD. FRANCISCUM KORDAC, ARCHIEPISCOPUM PRAGENSEM, ANTONIUM CYRILLUM STOJAN, ARCHIEPISCOPUM OLOMUCENSEM, CETEROSQUE EPISCOPOS CZECHOSLOVACHIAE, QUOS MAGNOPERE COHORTATUR UT RECTAE CLERI INSTITUTIONI VELINT OMNI OPE CONSULERE

Venerabiles fratres, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.—Saepe Nobis in mentem venire solet, venerabiles fratres, magno haud ita pridem solatio affectos Nos esse, cum licuit praesentes intueri complures e Czechoslovachia carissimos filios qui longinquam peregrinationem, sacris pastoribus suis ducibus, ideo suscepissent ut, suo nomine suorumque popularium ex omni ordine, eam fidem eamque in Successorem beati Petri observantiam summam declararent, quam populus Czechoslovacus, a maioribus acceptam, etiam nunc, in tantis periculis, integram inviolatamque retineret. Sed Nos illud non vos celabimus, quod ipsi facile intelligitis, quamvis grata ea Nobis accidat recordatio, non ipsam tamen posse omni tristitiae nube carere, dum et in desiderio erimus eorum, qui, quamquam non multi, misere ceciderunt, et in sollicitudine de nonnullis aliis, qui non bene videntur in officio consistere.

Nos igitur, omni cogitatione curaque incumbentes in tot salutem filiorum, quos praeclarissimi illi Slavoniae apostoli maximis sanctissimisque fidei ac pietatis vinculis huic Apostolicae Cathedrae adstringendos perstudiose curaverunt, primum omnium faciendum duximus, ut causas inquireremus, cur haec tam difficilia Ecclesiae Czechoslovachiae tempora exstitissent. In quo quidem usui Nobis ea fuerunt, quae a vobismet ipsis, venerabiles fratres, coram ex occasione, de istis rerum asperitatibus percontando vestrasque sententias rogando, cognoveramus. Iam vero malorum, quae conquerimur, hoc esse praecipuum caput comperimus, quod aliqua ex parte clerus non satis bene fuerit nec mente nec animo institutus, idque ex eo profectum esse maxime quod clericorum Seminaria, quae plene perfecteque secundum sacrorum praescripta canonum constituta essent, fere desiderarentur. Itaque non alio spectant hae Nostrae litterae, nisi ad vos magnopere cohortandos, ut

rectae cleri vestri institutione velitis omni ope consulere: qua quidem re populi quoque saluti optime per vos erit consultum.

Probe nostis, venerabiles fratres, quam necessarium sit sacerdoti, qui debet in Christi doctrina erudire ceteros, eam habere penitus perceptam planeque cognitam: quae cognitio efficit nimirum ut ipse vere *lux mundi* exsistat et, quod ei ab Ecclesia demandatum est in populo christiano magisterium veritatis, illud rite sanctaeque exerceat. Qui quidem non tantum *magister*, sed *medicus* etiam est animarum. 'Si ergo in eius opera passiones vivunt, qua praesumptione percussum mederi properat, qui in facie vulnus portat?'¹ Idem denique in grege fidelium gubernando praestare se debet *pastorem bonum*; 'qui—ut verbis utamur Decessoris Nostri sa. me. Pii X—idecirco dicitur alter Christus non una sane potestatis communicatione, sed etiam imitatione factorum qua expressam in se Christi imaginem referat.'² Quapropter in huius Apostolicae Sedis litteris documentisque de clero illud crebro occurrit, non posse sacerdotem, ut legatum, ut ministrum Christi, ut dispensatorem mysteriorum Dei, se suo sanctissimo muneri praestare parem, nisi et idonee sit sacrarum divinarumque rerum scientia instructus, et ea copia pietatis abundet, qua demum is homo Dei efficitur.³ Etenim necesse est sic eum in veritatis virtutisque possessione constare, ut ab omni vel errore vacet vel vitio: quod si 'utramvis in partem sive ob vitae improbitatem sive ob imperitiam propenderit, haud leve periculum tum ipsi, tum iis quibus praeest, imminet.'⁴ Ex his apparet quanti aestimanda sint clericorum Seminaria, quae quum nata sint factaque sacrae iuventuti et proprio studiorum curriculo et apta virtutum exercitatione ad sacerdotium conformandae, consequens est ut eisdem Seminariis praesertim debeat referri acceptum, si quis clerus doctrinae laude vitaeque sanctimonia florere videatur. Huiusmodi autem instituta, ut recte clerus saecularis in eis sacrum suum tamquam tyrocinium recte ponat, nemini non liquet, talia esse oportere, qualia et Patres Tridentinae Synodi voluerunt, et haec Apostolica Sedes, semper deinceps, sed maxime nostra memoria, esse iussit. Quare, venerabiles fratres, auctores Nos vobis sumus, ut detis operam, ne ulla iam sit nationis vestrae dioecesis, in qua suum desit Seminarium; ubi autem illud adsit, ad novi codicis canones ordinandum curetis. Quod si dioecesis alicuius exiguitas vel paupertas huius instituti copiam non patiatur, praescriptum canonis 1354 § 3 de Seminariis *interdioecesanis* servari oportebit.

Atque hic diligentissime, pro officii conscientia, vos attendere volumus, quanta cura obtemperandum sit eis Apostolicae Sedis praescriptionibus quae sunt de munerum in hoc genere distinctione conservanda deque deligendis iis quorum disciplinae et gubernationi committantur adolescentes clerici et a quibus illi bonam mentis ac spiritus conformationem habeant. 'Efficite, ut litteris disciplinisque tradendis lecti viri prae-ficiantur, in quibus doctrinae sanitas cum innocentia morum coniuncta

¹ S. Greg. M., *Reg. Past.*, i. 9.

² Lit. Encycl., *El Supremi*, IV oct. MCMIII.

³ Leo XIII, Lit. Encycl., *Fin dal principio*, 8 dec. 1902.

⁴ S. Greg. Naz., *Oratio apolog. de uga sua*, n. 4.

sit, ut, in re tanti momenti, confidere iure optimo possitis. Rectores disciplinae, magistros pietatis, eligite prudentia, consilio, rerum usu prae ceteris commendatos.¹

Praesertim oportet atque adeo necesse est, per biennium frequentent alumni praelectiones philosophiae scholasticae, eoque in studio magistrum religiose sequantur Thomam Aquinatem; quadriennio deinceps ipsi versentur, eodem duce, in sacra theologia coniunctisque disciplinis, ut canone 1365 praecipitur. De studiorum autem ratione convenienter temporibus constituenda illas quoque litteras cupimus in vestrum usum convertatis, quibus hac de re ipsa sacrum Consilium Seminariis et studiorum Universitatibus praepositum die 26 aprilis an. 1920 Italiae sacrorum Antistites edocuit. Ceterum propositae rei minime expedit disciplinas seu facultates, ut aiunt, theologiae tradendae, in quibus ad academicos honorum gradus contendere liceat, multas patere, easque a maxima clericorum parte celebrari: neque enim homines sacri ordinis omnes doctores debent esse, verumtamen cum boni tum eruditi omnes. Quoniam vero, qui scholarum magisteria quaedam vel maiora munera obtineant, eos decet supra ceteros eminere doctrina atque etiam doctrinae insignibus esse ornatos, idcirco, ut satis vobis suppetat sacerdotum talium, vos in eas, quas dicimus, facultates tot alumnos vestros mittetis studiis alterioribus excolendos, quot dioecesi opus esse iudicaveritis, qui quidem ingenio virtutisque indole praestent aequalibus fiduciamque in omnibus rebus vobis afferant exitus boni. Hoc loco peropportunum ducimus, venerabiles fratres, hortari vos ut Collegium Bohemum huius almae Urbis, sedulo diligenterque praecipuis quibusdam curis fovere velitis. Hic enim sub oculis Nostris optimae cleri vestri spes aluntur, atque vel ad severitatem disciplinae, vel ad soliditatem pietatis, vel ad integritatem doctrinae tam feliciter succrescunt tantoque Nostro cum gaudio, ut eos in hac *corona nostra* clericorum ex diversis nationibus, Romae studiorum causa consistentium, partem lectissimam habeamus.

Sed enim praecipuum Episcopi studium summamque diligentiam iure sibi Seminarium dioecesanum vindicat; in eoque maxime curas cogitationesque vestras evigilare scimus, venerabiles fratres, cum ipsum, hortante decessore Nostro,² Nobisque valde probantibus, *cordis quisque vestri delicias* habeatis. Itaque non est, cur vobis demonstramus hoc esse mirifice utile, ut perpetua sit vestra cum Seminarii alumni consuetudo. Quod qui faciunt, sancto funguntur officio; quandoquidem 'Episcopi est omnia et singula quae ad rectam Seminarii dioecesani administrationem, regimen, profectum necessaria et opportuna videntur, decernere, eaque ut fideliter observentur, curare.'³ Sacrorum Antistes igitur ut suorum progressionem clericorum ad verum bonumque assequendum paterno studio persequi possit et provehere, optimum factu erit, sancti Alfonsi Doctoris iudicio,⁴ si ipse identidem Seminarium

¹ Leo XIII, Lit. Encycl., *Quod multum*, die XXII aug. MDCCCLXXXVI.

² Lit. Encycl., *E Supremi*, IV oct. MCMIII.

³ *Cod. iur. can.*, c. 1357.

⁴ *Rifl. utili ai Vescovi*, c. i. § 1; operum, vol. iii. p. 866.

adeat, alumnos ad colendas virtutes litterasque opportunis cohortationibus incendat, scholasticis quoque circulis ac disputationibus intersit, quo eos ad aemulandum inter se studiorum contentione mirum quantum excitabit. Ita etiam fiet ut Episcopus, qui suos per se clericos penitus cognoverit, non temere eis manus imponat, verum sacerdotes faciat qui sint secundum Cor Iesu, id est qui ministerium suum honorificent implentes in se ipsis voluntatem Dei quae est omnium sanctificatio.¹

Iam vero, quoniam in hac causa parum Episcopi profecerint, nisi suae quisque dioecesis sacerdotes adiutores habuerint, Nos istos, quotquot sunt, omnes impense hortamur ut, ad Seminarium sive instituendum sive restituendum, suis Ordinariis, quacumque possint ope, sint adiumento. Habeant hanc pacis sedem et studiorum domum et virtutum officinam, qua ipsi sunt usi, tamquam dioecesis cor, unde in omnes Ecclesiae venas spiritualis vita diffundatur. Huc et libentes operam suam rogati, conferant; et parvulorum de suo grege, in quibus aliquod divinae vocationis lumen deprehenderint, accuratissima diligentia praeparent animos; et stipem etiam, pro suis facultatibus, mittant, feracem optimorum sane fructuum. Nec vero eorum exemplum exiguam vim habebit apud laicos viros, ut, inter cetera caritatis et religionis officia, de suis bonis quam maxime promovere studeant Seminarium dioecesanum, ubi ii educantur, qui pro universi populi salute sunt laboraturi.

Utique, Dei providentis beneficio, non pauci (remotis iis quos defecisse dolemus) sunt in Czechoslovachia sacerdotes, qui quidem instituti ut oportet, imbutique Domini spiritu, digne ambulantes vocatione qua vocati sunt. Ac libet confidere non longo tempore futurum, ut clerus iste universus fidelissimum se administrum atque expeditum tamquam instrumentum Deo praebeat in suam ipsius et aliorum sanctificationem ad aedificationem corporis Christi. Ex quo autem istic apud clericos studium sancte pro officio vivendi coeperit revirescere, illud exspectare posse videmur ut fratres etiam miseri, qui a Nobis recesserunt, Ecclesiae aliquando vocem audiant, sollicite eos ad maternum gremium revocantis, omniaque omnis generis praesidia et animi solatia eis pollicentis, quae nunc procul ab ipsa aberrantes frustra quaerunt. Iam clero Czechoslovachiae, atque adeo omnium nationum Slavonicarum, alius, divina providentia, patet multoque latior campus, in quo utilissime elaboret ad regnum Iesu Christi dilatandum: qui labor eo felicius sane successerit, quo diligentior ei praeparatio fuerit adhibita. Etenim is est hodie cursus rerum, ut a populis Orientis Slavi, quos factum iam pridem ab hac Cathedra discidium miserrimos habet, spes nonnulla ostendatur sanctae unitatis Nobiscum redintegrandae. Vestrum est igitur, venerabiles fratres, clerique vestri, quibus per apostolos Slavorum Cyrillum et Methodium una cum civili cultu Romana fides illuxit, hanc divinitus munitam vobis viam animose ingredi. Huic autem tantae rei adiuvandae scimus quasdam natas esse piorum societates et eas apud omnes fere Slavicas gentes feliciter propagari. Ex quibus praesertim cum laude

¹ Exhort. ad Clerum: *Haerent animo*, Pii PP. X, IV augusti MCMVII.

commemorare placet *Apostolatum* (ut aiunt) *SS. Cyrilli et Methodii sub patrocinio Virginis*, qui quidem in Czechoslovachia, in Polonia, in Jugoslavia et in Bulgaria increbrescit non mediocri cum fructu. Huiusmodi Nos consociationem omnibus Ordinariis commendatam volumus et, iis auctoribus, in unaquaque paroecia constitutam, quotidie magis apud Slavos disseminari cupimus, ut, Deo favente, ille dies appropinquet quo fiet *unum ovile et unus pastor*.

Hoc Nos exoptantes, quod et fidelibus hortamento et errantibus admonitioni et eis, qui Nobiscum dissident, invitamento debet esse, auspiciem divinorum munerum, vobis, venerabiles fratres, vestroque clero ac populo universo apostolicam benedictionem praecipua cum benevolentia impertimus.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum, die xxx mensis novembris, in festo sancti Andreae Apostoli, anno mcmxxi, Pontificatus Nostri octavo.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

CIRCULAR LETTER TO ALL BISHOPS FROM THE SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE PROPAGANDA ON THE THIRD CENTENARY OF ITS FOUNDATION

(December 3, 1921)

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE PROPAGANDA FIDE

AD UNIVERSOS LOCORUM ORDINARIOS LITTERAE CIRCULARES TERTIO EXEUNTE SAECULO AB INSTITUTA SACRA CONGREGATIONE

Illm̃e ac Revm̃e Domine,

Gloriosissimae memoriae Gregorius PP. XV, Apostolica Constitutione *Inscrutabili divinae Providentiae arcano* die 22 iunii 1622 lata, Sacram Congregationem Christiano Nomini Propagando sollemniter erigebat, cuius praeclarum non minus quam grave munus esset, missionibus omnibus, ad praedicandum apud omnes gentes Evangelium ubique constitutis vel in posterum constituendis, praeesse, easque moderari et dirigere.

Quot quantaque religionis humanique cultus opera, auspice atque duce Sacra hac Congregatione, Evangelii praecones, inelyto Martyre Fidele a Sigmaringa praeunte, sive in Europae nationibus, sive in exteris iisque remotissimis regionibus atque insulis, tribus hisce saeculis perfecerint, soli Deo cognitum est.

Messis tamen immensa adhuc manet colligenda; interminatae regionum magnitudines incultae iacent, innumerabiles hominum multitudines in tenebris adhuc sedent et in umbra mortis, exspectantes nuntium pacis et lucis Evangelii.

Tertio itaque exeunte saeculo ab erectione Sacrae huius Congregationis, visum est diem natalem eiusdem sollemniter commemorare. Decet enim in memoriam revocare quae tot Romani Pontifices, inde a

Gregorio XV, curis indefessis, sapientissimis consiliis, opibus inexhaustis, pro sacris missionibus praestiterint.

Iuvat recolere quam praeclara per hanc Sacram Congregationem de Propaganda Fide, animos ad fidem catholicam atque humanitatem informando, universo terrarum orbi beneficia obvenerint.

Iuvat commemorare ingentes labores missionariorum, eorumque utriusque sexus cooperatorum, necnon auxilia in opus christianae evangelizationis conlata, non modo a munificis ac divitibus benefactoribus, sed etiam a tenuioribus christifidelibus, qui sanctissimo eidem operi promovendo nec stipem nec preces suas deesse siverunt.

At imprimis convenit sollemnes referre gratias Deo Optimo Maximo, a quo bona cuncta processerunt, atque Immaculae Virgini Mariae Apostolorum Reginae, quae a divino Filio suo Redemptore Nostro Iesu Christo haec omnia humano generi impetravit.

Quae cum nuper ab infrascripto Sacrae huius Congregationis Cardinali Praefecto exposita fuerint SS^mo D^{ño} Nostro Benedicto PP. XV, qui, inde ab initio gloriosi sui pontificatus, sollicitudinem pro regni Dei dilatatione inter praecipuas supremi officii sui curas habuit, idem Summus Pontifex benignissimo laetoque animo, non solum indicenda festa saecularia laudare comprobareque dignatus est, verum etiam ea digna omnino iudicavit, quae Summus ipse Pontifex et praesentia sua honestaret, et largitione caelestium thesaurorum proveheret.

Statuit itaque Sanctitas Sua, ut tribus continuis diebus, qui Dominicam Pentecostes futuri anni MCMXXII praecedent, in Urbe habeantur publicae ad Deum preces pro Fidei catholicae dilatatione; simulque christifidelibus per opportunas conciones missionum sacrarum opus et graves earum necessitates explicentur.

Dominica vero Pentecostes Sanctitas Sua in Patriarchali Basilica Vaticana Missam sollemnem celebrabit, atque inter Missarum sollemnia homiliam ad populum Ipse habebit de catholicae Fidei propagatione. Edixit praeterea Sanctitas Sua ut de hisce omnibus tempestive totius orbis catholici Ordinarii edocerentur, eisdemque desiderium eiusdem Sanctitatis Suae panderetur, ut, simili ratione, pro temporum locorumve circumstantiis, tridua exercitia pro sacris missionibus, in ecclesiis cathedralibus, paroeccialibus, necnon dignioribus aliis ecclesiis singularum dioecesium vel missionum instituuntur.

Quem in finem Sanctitas Sua benigne concedere dignata est Indulgentiam quingentorum dierum singulis supplicationis diebus lucrandam, necnon Indulgentiam Plenariam in die sollemnis commemorationis, sub consueta conditionibus. Quas Indulgentias animabus in Purgatorio degentibus applicabiles Sanctitas Sua pariter declaravit.

Concessit insuper Summus Pontifex ut singuli Ordinarii, vel per se vel per sacerdotem sibi benevisum, Papalem Benedictionem impertire possint, in ecclesiis in quibus, ut supra, supplicationes fient.

Optatis SS^mi Domini plene respondebunt Ordinarii si litteras dederint pastorales quibus populis sibi commissis gravissimas missionum causas explicant, et officium, quo fideles tenentur, Deum et Virginem SS^mam precandi pro Fidei propagatione, sacrasque missiones adjuvandi pro viribus.

Itaque, dum per praesentes litteras Summi Pontificis iussa et desideria Tecum communico, Deum ex corde rogo ut diutissime Te sospitem incolumemque servet.

Ex aedibus huius Sacrae Congregationis, die festo S. Francisci Xaverii anno MCMXXI.

Amplitudinis Tuae

Addictissimus servus

G. M. CARD. VAN ROSSUM, *Praefectus*.

L. ✠ S.

✠ P. FUMASONI-BIONDI, Arch. Diocletan., *Secretarius*.

Insuper Beatissimus Pater, occasione eiusdem appellentis celeberratis, hanc quoque preculam christifidelium pietati recitandam proposuit :

PREGHIERA PER LA PROPAGAZIONE DELLA FEDE

O Gesù, non è spenta l'eco della parola, con cui la scarsità degli operai Voi mettevate a raffronto dell'immensità di una messe: *messis quidem multa, operarii autem pauci*.

Già sono scorsi tre secoli dacchè l'Apostolica Sede ha provveduto in maniera ordinata e costante all'evangelizzazione degli infedeli. Molti frutti ha raccolto lo zelo dei missionarii inviati dalla Sacra Congregazione di Propaganda Fide: è stato seme di cristiani il sangue versato da quel generoso atleta che, or sono pure tre secoli, segnava le primizie dei martiri della stessa Sacra Congregazione. Ma nondimeno, quanti popoli sono ancora avvolti nelle tenebre dell'ignoranza! quante genti siedono ancora fra l'ombre di morte! Oh! come è doloroso paragonare il numero dei credenti a quello più grande degli infedeli!

Un tale paragone mentre ci fa apprezzare meglio l'ammirabile lume della Fede da cui noi siamo guidati nel terrestre pellegrinaggio, ravviva insieme nell'animo nostro il ricordo di quelle altre divine parole: 'Pregate dunque il padrone della messe che mandi operai alla sua messe': *Rogate ergo dominum messis ut mittat operarios in messem suam*.

Voi, o Signore, siete il padrone della messe, in cui è raffigurata la moltitudine degli uomini. A voi dunque domandiamo di moltiplicare il numero di missionarii, di accrescerne lo zelo e di benedirne le fatiche, affinchè il buon seme della divina parola dia frutti abbondanti, da raccogliere nei celesti granai.

Esaudite, o Signore, questa preghiera a noi suggerita dal desiderio di vedere esteso il vostro santo regno. E, poichè più dal cuore che dal labbro ci esce ogni giorno la bella aspirazione: *adveniat regnum tuum*; date a noi fermezza e costanza nel proposito che pur vi presentiamo, di concorrere in ogni miglior modo possibile, e secondo la misura delle nostre forze, a favorire l'opera della Propagazione della Fede.

Concediamo a tutti i fedeli, per ogni volta che reciteranno la presente preghiera, l'Indulgenza di 300 giorni, e a quelli che l'avranno recitata ogni giorno, la Plenaria una volta al mese alle consuete condizioni.

Dal Vaticano, 17 novembre, 1921.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

LETTER OF THE HOLY SEE TO THE APOSTOLIC DELEGATE OF THE EAST INDIES

(October 15, 1921)

EPISTOLA

AD R. P. D. PETRUM PISANI, ARCHIEPISCOPUM TIT. CONSTANTIENSEM,
DELEGATUM APOSTOLICUM IN INDIIS ORIENTALIBUS: NONNULLA
PATERNE ADMONENS IN ECCLESIAE UTILITATEM

Venerabilis frater, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.—Libenter quidem egregios amoris atque obsequii sensus accepimus quibus Nos Indiae catholici e Madraspolitano conventu, in Deiparae honorem habito, ineunte hoc anno persecuti sunt; eisdemque gratulamur vehementer quod ipse coetus in sollemnem cessit christianae fidei ac pietatis erga Immaculatam Virginem significationem. Iamvero ut rei fructus permaneat, et obsignetur quodammodo promissio coëuntium, qui quidem ad aram sacram polliciti sunt se, Episcoporum ductu, servaturos esse proposita inita, opportunum Nos hic ducimus viam ostendere quam catholicus quisque tum singillatim tum socialiter religiose sequi debeat. Haec via seu norma, uti constat ex Evangelio, ex apostolicis litteris scriptisque sanctorum Patrum, posita est in obedientia fidelium pastoribus legitimis iuxta illud: ‘oboedite praepositis vestris et subiacete eis.’ Etenim Episcopi in sui regendis dioecesibus nullo prorsus modo ex subditorum arbitrio pendent, neque ulli alii in agendis rebus quam Sedi Apostolicae rationem reddere debent, cum soli Petro dictum sit: ‘Pasce agnos meos, pasce oves meas.’ Quapropter officium est tum cleri tum fidelium improbare non modo in se ipsis sed etiam in aliis eum, qui invaluit, *independentiae* spiritum; id enim occasionem praebet religionis nostrae adversariis zizania in vinea Domini disseminandi. Caveant igitur ne in Episcoporum decreta inquirant, cum ea suis sententiis non respondent, neve ipsa percenseant aut parvipendant quoquo modo, privatim vel publice, verbis vel scriptis, uti iam Litteris Nostris encyclicis *Ad Beatissimi Apostolorum* admonuimus: ‘Nemo privatus, vel libris diariisve vulgandis vel sermonibus publice habendis, se in Ecclesia pro magistro gerat. Norunt omnes cui sit a Deo magisterium Ecclesiae datum.’ Ecclesia est plebs sacerdoti adunata et pastori suo grex adhaerens. Ex quo sequitur cum Ecclesia non esse qui cum Episcopo non sit. Secus enim agentes sacerdotes vel laici, acatholicos, quos inter versantur, imitarentur, scandalum eisdem et ansam praestando ut a verae Ecclesiae sinu remoti permaneant. Operam potius navent suo Episcopo, reverenter eidem obsequendo; neque—etsi integrum cuique est ad Apostolicam Sedem iusta de causa provocare—praetextant, ut se ab Ordinarii auctoritate et iussis subducant, velle se praescriptiones sequi ab eadem Apostolica Sede vel ab aliis Episcopis pro sua cuiusque dioecesi fortasse latas. Quod si interdum quasdam suas animadversiones vel optata Ordinario referre censerent, obsequenter id faciant, atque dumtaxat ob veritatis triumphum maiusque Ecclesiae bonum, numquam vero imponendo vel minitando, aut, quod peius esset, civiles

auctoritates, ecclesiasticis negotiis prorsus extraneas, adeundo. Verumtamen iurisdictio Episcoporum non modo in iis exercetur quae ad religiosas et ecclesiasticas res pertinent, sed in ceteris etiam quaestionibus cuiusvis naturae, quae directe vel indirecte cum Ecclesiae sanctae emolumento animarumque salute coniunguntur. Itaque Episcopi triplici sua potestate utentes, *magisterii* scilicet, *ministerii* atque *regiminis*, tueri debent et auctoritative moderari quae sequuntur: tum *administrationes ecclesiasticas*, quamvis in iis regundis laudabili opera utantur sacerdotum vel laicorum, cum Episcopus renuntiatus sit in canonibus sacris tutor natus cuiuslibet pii operis vel foundationis: tum *catholicam iuventutis educationem*, quae quidem numquam a religiosa institutione seiungenda est; cum enim Servator Dominus de se loquens professus sit ‘unus est magister vester, Christus,’ Christus vero in persona Episcoporum vivat ac doceat, iuxta illud ‘qui vos audit me audit,’ ipsorum est legitimas ferre normas quas magistri catholici perdiligenter sequantur in iis quae ad scholas catholicas et ad clericorum conformationem in Seminariis maioribus vel minoribus spectant: tum denique *necessitudines seu relationes fidelium cum acatholicis in vita civili*, iudicando si usus et consuetudo non quibusdam coetibus vel adhaesio quibusdam philanthropicis consociationibus, quae neutrales seu areligiosas se esse dicunt, grave periculum praebent, in aliquo casu vel regione, a recta fide deficiendi. Praeterea in eo qui praeest non solum persona hominis sed, quavis ratione posthabita, Deus ipse conspiciendus est qui nos alloquitur, admonet, moderatur, iuxta illum Scripturae locum: ‘tamquam Deo exhortante per nos’ (II Cor., v, 20). Omnes profecto exoptant, etiam in religiosis rebus, se ab iis gubernari qui sint eiusdem nationis; in quo quidem improbandi non sunt illi Indiae catholici qui ab indigenis Pastoribus se regi vellent. Huic optato numquam sane adversata est Ecclesia, quandoquidem in ea non est ‘Gentilis et Iudaeus, circumcisio et praeputium, barbarus et Scythia, servus et liber,’ neque est *acceptio personarum*: idque luculenter ex eo liquet quod Pontifices Maximi summam curam semper adhibuerunt ut clerus indigena cotidie magis in sanctimonia doctrinaque proficeret. Verum Ecclesiae tantum est decernere tempus quando eidem optato satisfieri conveniat; Ecclesiae, inquam, quae singularium dioecesium utilitatibus tamquam e specula invigilans, iam antiquitus missionales miserat, qui per asperrima quaeque itinerum, miseriarum, persecutionum, christianum nomen regionibus istis inferrent. Quisquis igitur, rerum eventus praecipitando, iudicium Romae quomodocumque, voce scriptisve, praevenire contendit, contumacem simul et inobsequentem se praebet erga Iesu Christi Vicarium, quasi Eidem non sit curae de filiorum Indiae salute atque prosperitate. Sed inter alia quae in Mariali conventu acta sunt, illud etiam constitutum esse comperimus ut opera missionariorum in convertendis ethnicis ad Christi fidem in dies promoveretur. Ad hanc rem, uti pluries ediximus, nihil est Nobis optatius quam praedicando Evangelio non modo europaei sacerdotes, verum etiam indigena clerus det operam, cum ipsius maxime, prae ceteris, munus sit populares suos infideles ad Ecclesiae amplexum vocare et perducere, ut illa

verba decessoris Nostri f. r. Leonis XIII quantocius felicem habeant exitum: 'Filii tui, India, administri tibi salutis.' Meminerint Indi omnes quantum valeret ad ethnicorum conversionem, priscis illis Ecclesiae temporibus, christianorum exemplum qui tamquam fratres inter se diligebant. Hos igitur ipsi sequantur, et, dissidiis compositis, ita et concordia inter se coniugantur et legitimae auctoritati s. bsint, ut in pace et caritate Christi semper permaneant *cor unum et anima una*; quae vitae ratio plurimum quidem conferet ad ethnicorum conversione. Nec omittant pastoralia Episcoporum munia (nimis quantum iam gravia), allevare, seque gratos praestare erga tam strenuos inclytorum Ordinu et Congregationum alumnos, qui vitam viresque pro Indiae emolumento impendunt. Quod si fecerint, sciant magnum se Nobis quoque solatium allaturos: peculiari enim amore Indos prosequimur; inter ipsos quodammodo per Delegatum Nostrium versamur; nihilque faciemus reliqui ut, quavis soluta quaestione et tranquillatis animis, India christianis omnibus Asiae communitatibus in exemplum praeferat. Atque interea validissimam opem magnae Dei Matris implorantes, quae in Mariali conventu *Patrona Indiae* renuntiata est, ac fore confisi ut 'Qui incepit in vobis opus bonum, ipse perficiat, confirmet solidetque,' in auspiciu donorum caelestium itemque ut praecipuae benevolentiae Nostrae signum, tibi, venerabilis frater, Episcopis omnibus istius regionis, universoque clero ac populo unicuique eorum concredito, apostolicam benedictionem effuso animo impertimus.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum, die xv mensis octobris mcmxxi, Pontificatus Nostri anno octavo.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

APOSTOLIC LETTER TO THE MODERATOR OF THE SEMINARY OF DUCENTA IN CAMPANIA, CONGRATULATING HIM ON HIS WORK FOR THE FOREIGN MISSIONS

(November 7, 1921)

EPISTOLA

AD R. P. PAULUM MANNA, SEMINARIUM DUCENTANI 'A SACRO CORDE IESU' MISSIONIBUS EXTERIS PROVEHENDIS MODERATORI: DE HOC NOVO MISSIONALI INSTITUTO VEHEMENTER GRATULATUR

Dilecte fili, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.—Libenter admodum certiores facti sumus a dilecto filio Nostro Cardinali Praefecto S. C. de Propaganda Fide, Seminarium, augusto Cordi Iesu dicatum, Ducentae, Aversanae dioecesis in Campania, munificentia pientissimi canonici Aloisii Grassia, nuper defuncti, esse conditum, eo quidem consilio ut missiones sacrae apud infideles promoverentur; in hoc enim salutarem fructum perspicimus ex encyclicis Litteris *Maximum illud* proficiscentem, quae quidem feliciter, propitio Deo, in dies nova capiunt incrementa. Profecto exoptandum erat ut etiam in inferiore Italia missionale institutum excitaretur, iis non absimile quae in aliis septentrionalis Italiae urbibus iam florent: quapropter valde nunc de Ducentana domo gratulamur, utpote quae plurimos Evangelii praecones, divino

nutu, per inferiorem Italiam suscitatura sit. Huius spei certe non fallet eventus, si Episcopi earum regionum simul cum clero, nobis obsequentes, non modo missionales vocationes foverint, sed etiam bonos omnes hortati erunt ut rem precibus ac stipe adiuvent. Ceterum omnes norunt quam munifice conferre soleat meridionalis Italiae populus ad ea omnia quae ad magnificentiam sacri cultus pertineat; sed quomodo melius Deus coli potest quam ipsius Dei regnum per terrarum orbem propagando? Iamvero non pauci fuerunt ex Italia meridionali qui, hoc in campo, de christiana civilique re bene meriti sunt; in primisque ille Dei famulus Matthaeus Ripa, qui anno MDCCXXIV pium opus a *Sacra Familia Iesu Christi* seu *Collegium Sinense* Neapoli constituit; is enim multis peragratis Caelestis Imperii regionibus, nonnullos bonae spei adolescentes illinc abduxit, ut iidem rite a pietate litterisque instructi, populares suos deinceps ad christianam fidem converterent. Non defuit autem Deus sanctis viri coeptis; opportuna enim catholicorum ope, Collegium Sinense diu quidem eximios missionales Ecclesiae suppeditavit, ex quibus adhuc nonnulli supersunt. Meminerint qui sunt ex inferiore Italia, plurimos sane populares suos in variis Ordinibus Institutisque dedisse operam sacris missionibus, et aliquos, vel recens, suum sanguinem pro Fide effudisse. Recte factorum memor quae a maioribus acta sunt, meridionalis Italiae clerus populusque par sit huic temporis missionalis incrementi, id Seminarium considerans non modo ad Aversanam dioecesim, sed ad omnem meridionalem Italiam pertinens. Quo autem generali emolumento, non particulari dumtaxat, id opus haberetur, Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide ut suam propriam hanc institutionem accepit, atque, se advigilante, eam tradidit regendam Mediolanensi Exterarum Missionum Societati, utpote quae, eum plurimos sollertesque Evangelii praecones Ecclesiae praebuerit, et quandam habet apostolatus sacri traditionem, et spem certam felicitis exitus. Velint igitur Episcopi omnes ex inferiore Italia *Seminarium a Sacro Corde Iesu Missionibus Exteris provehendis*, peculiari suo prosequi patrocinio, quandoquidem tantum universae Ecclesiae bonum cum ea re coniungitur. Nos vero quam vehementissime largitati bonorum omnium hoc opus commendantes, id fore pro certo habemus ut, auspice magna Dei Matre, patronis autem Iosepho et Francisco Xaverio, plurimum valitura sit haec nova institutio ad regnum Iesu Domini amplificandum, eoque maiores allatura utilitates quo graviora sunt missionum damna et contraria acatholicorum conata. Tuque, dilecte fili, perge alacriter, uti facis, saluberrimum id opus urgere; nec enim certe Episcoporum adiumenta, quorum Nos diligentiam probe novimus, defutura tibi erunt, neque, multo minus, ipsius Domini auxilia cuius quidem gloriam tantopere promovere tu niteris. Atque in caelestium munerum auspiciu itemque ut peculiaris benevolentiae Nostrae pignus, apostolicam benedictionem tibi, dilecte fili, et iis omnibus qui quoquo modo rem iuverint, in primisque venerabili fratri Septimio Caracciolo, Episcopo Aversano, cunctoque clero ac populo ipsius dioecesis, effuso animo impertimus.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum, die VII mensis novembris MCMXXI, Pontificatus Nostri anno octavo.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

PRIVILEGE OF ANTICIPATING MATINS AND LAUDS GRANTED TO MEMBERS OF THE 'PIA UNIO CLERI'

(December 2, 1921)

[Matins and Lauds may be anticipated from noon of the previous day, provided the Office of the day has been already recited.]

S. CONGREGATIO DE PROPAGANDA FIDE

NOVUM SPIRITUALE PRIVILEGIUM CONCEDITUR SACERDOTIBUS PIAE UNIONIS
CLERI A MISSIONIBUS ADSSCRIPTIS

RESCRIPTUM

Ex audientia Ss^{mi} diei 1 decembris 1921: Sanctitas Sua, ad relationem infrascripti Cardinalis Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide Praefecti, benigne dignata est concedere ut singuli sacerdotes qui nomen dederint aut daturi sint in posterum Piae Unioni Cleri a missionibus, anticipare possint vel a meridie recitationem Matutini cum Laudibus subsequentis diei, dummodo tamen officium diei iam persolverint.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, die 2 decembris 1921.

G. M. CARD. VAN ROSSUM, *Praefectus*.

L. ✠ S.

✠ PETRUS, Archiep. Diocletanus, *Secretarius*.

DOUBT REGARDING THE RECITATION OF THE LITANY OF LORETO

(November 10, 1921)

[The reply confirms the recent decree of the same Congregation.]

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

DE RATIONE RECITANDI VEL CANTANDI LITANIAS LAURETANAS
DUBIA

Expostulatum est a Sacra Rituum Congregatione pro opportuna declaratione:

I. An in Litaniiis Laurentanis ita cantari possit prima tripla invocatio ad personas Ss^{mae} Trinitatis, ut Sacerdos cantet *Kyrie eleison*, *Christe eleison*, et populus repetat *Kyrie eleison*, *Christe eleison*, et postea idem Sacerdos prosequatur *Christe audi nos*, *Christe exaudi nos*, et populus respondeat *Christe audi nos*, *Christe exaudi nos*?

II. An loco dicendi ter *Agnus Dei* in fine Litaniarum, semel tantum dicatur: 'Agnus Dei qui tollis peccata mundi, parce nobis Domine, exaudi nos Domine, miserere nobis?'

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, audito specialis Commissionis suffragio, omnibus perpensis respondendum censuit: *Negative* iuxta Decreta, et servetur integer Ordo Litaniarum cum indulgentiis adnexis approbatus, nempe: *Kyrie eleison—Christe eleison—Kyrie eleison*, etc., usque ad finem.

Atque ita rescripsit ac declaravit.

Die 10 novembris 1921.

✠ A. CARD. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae, *S.R.C. Praef.*

L. ✠ S.

ALEXANDER VERDE, *Secretarius*.

REVIEWS AND NOTES

MATERIALS FOR THE HISTORY OF THE FRANCISCAN PROVINCE OF IRELAND, A.D. 1230-1450. Collected and Edited by the late Father E. B. Fitzmaurice, O.F.M., and A. G. Little. Manchester : The University Press. 1920.

THE contents of this volume will be of great interest to all students of Irish ecclesiastical history and institutions in the later Middle Ages; hence we have pleasure in introducing it to our readers now, even though its issue took place in 1920, about a year and a half ago. The body of the work consists of extracts from a great variety of sources illustrating the period of foundation and the subsequent fortunes of the many Franciscan houses in Ireland. The collection of these materials was commenced fourteen years ago by the late Father E. B. Fitzmaurice, O.F.M., a most industrious and very careful student, as anyone who looks into this book will readily testify. Father Fitzmaurice died in 1913, before his labours were completed. The papers collected by him were handed over to Mr A. G. Little after his death, and the volume before us has been edited by the last-mentioned scholar, and provided with an Introduction, which is a summary of the history of the Franciscan Order in Ireland down to 1450, and with three appendices and three indexes.

St. Francis of Assisi died on October 4, 1226. We learn from Mr. Little that Father Fitzmaurice intended to show or argue in his book that the Franciscan Order had been established in Ireland prior to the death of its holy founder. The question is discussed in the opening pages of the Introduction, where the evidence for and against Father Fitzmaurice's view is put forth. Mr. Little is of opinion that the formal establishment of the Irish Province did not take place before 1231 or 1232.

The problem of the nationality of John Duns Scotus is discussed on pages 87, 88. The summary there presented indicates the views of Father André Callebaut, O.F.M., who has written on the question in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* in 1917 and 1920. The conclusion is that he whom we have all learned to refer to as Scotus was named Duns or Dunus from a place called Duns, situated in the diocese of St. Andrew in Scotland. Here are Father Callebaut's exact words:—

‘Puisqu'il est prouvé, d'une part, que les contemporains font de notre Jean Duns Scot un Écossais, et que d'autre part, son nom *Scotus* signifiait pour les contemporains comme pour nous *Ecossais*, et qu'enfin la patrie du Maître Thomas de Duns Scotus est *Duns*, au diocèse de St. Andrew en Écosse; tout critique impartial regardera la controverse peremptoirement tranchée en faveur de l'Écosse.’

In relation to sources written in the Irish language, Mr. Little tells us he has had to depend on translations. There is extant in Irish a list

of Franciscan foundations, with dates, which does not appear to have been known either to the deceased or surviving editor of this book. It occurs on a fly-leaf of the manuscript usually referred to as O'Clery's *Book of Irish Pedigrees*, and preserved in the library of the Royal Irish Academy. This Book of Pedigrees was really a reference-book used by the compilers of *The Annals of the Four Masters*. It is hard to discover how the list came to be compiled, but many of the entries correspond with the details which the finished Annals afford of the beginnings of certain Franciscan houses. There is, however, more than one new item, and possibly Mr. Little or some future investigator in the same field may find something of interest in it. I therefore print it here, identifying the places mentioned, so far as they are known :—

‘An bliadhain d’aois ar ttigearna i ndernad na mainéstreacha so sios í n-onoir do Dhia 7 do Naom Fran :

‘The year of the Age of Our Lord in which these abbeys below were founded in honour of God and of Saint Francis :

1224. Mainistir Eochaille 7 m. Atha Luain (Youghal and Athlone).

1226. m. Corcaighe (Cork).

1240. m. Puirt Lairge 7 Tighe Molaga (Waterford and Timoleague).

1247. m. na Gaillmhe 7 m. Insi (Galway and Ennis).

1251. m. Cille na Mullach (Buttevant).

1253. m. Arda Ferta (Ardfert).

1254. m. Glais.

[This entry is erroneous and incomplete. It should run

‘m. Glas Cille Dara,’ i.e., the Gray Abbey of Kildare.

See *Four Masters*, sub anno.]

1258. m. Claena (Clane).

1264. m. Arda Macha (Armagh).

1320. m. Beanntraighe (Bantry).

1336. m. Cairrge na Siuire (Carrick-on-Suir).

1340. m. Airbhealaigh (Muckruss).

1351. m. Rosa Erbhealaigh (Roscrea).

1353. m. Cille Conaill (Kilconell).

1393. m. Cille Ite.

[There appears to be a double error here. In the year 1303 the abbey of Cill Achaidh or Killeigh was founded.

This seems to be the entry intended.]

1402. m. Chuinche (Quin).

1420. m. Essa Gebhtine (Askeaton).

1447. m. Laoighesi (Abbeyleix).

1460. m. na Maighne hi Tir Amhalgatha 7 Insi Arcain isin Mumhain 7 Insi Corthadh i nOirghiallaibh (Moyn, Inishereen, and Enniscorthy).

1462. m. Muineachain. Feilim mac Briain mic Ardgal Mheg Mathgamhna ba tigherna i nOirghiallaibh an tan sin (Monaghan, Felim, son of Brian, son of Ardgal Macmahon was lord in Oriel then).

1464. m. Atha Dara (Adare).
 1465. m. Chille Creidhe (Kilcrea).
 1470. m. Lesa Laichtnin (Ballylongford).
 1471. m. Gallbaili Etharlach (Gallbally in Aherlow).
 1474. m. Dhuin na nGall (Donegal).
 1479. m. Milic (Meelick).
 1485. m. Arann (Aran).
 1486. m. Cille Cuilind (Kilcullen).
 1508. m. Baile Ui Ruairc. O Ruairc, Eoghan mac Tighernain mic Taidhg, 7 ingen I Briain, Mairgreg ingen Conchobair, tuc uatha í (Dromahaire. O Rourke, Eoghan, son of Tighernan, son of Taidhg, and O Briain's daughter, Margaret daughter of Conchobhar, founded it).

It has been mentioned above that Mr. Little acknowledges, as regards materials in the Irish language, his dependance on a translator. If such a translator were to look into the indexes he would find more than one error. There is no such name, for example, as Tuaith Maighe: Tuath dá Mháighe is better attested, as, for example, notes, *Four Masters*, iv. 1310.

PAUL WALSH.

BOOKS, Etc., RECEIVED

- America* : A Catholic Review (January).
The Ecclesiastical Review (January). U.S.A.
The Rosary Magazine (January). Somerset, Ohio.
The Catholic World (January). New York.
The Austral Light (December). Melbourne.
The Ave Maria (January). Notre Dame, Indiana.
The Catholic Bulletin (January). Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Irish Monthly (January). Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Month (January). London: Longmans.
Études (January). Paris: 12 Rue Oudinot (VII^e).
Revue Pratique d'Apologétique (January). Paris: Beauchesne.
The Fortnightly Review (January). St. Louis, Mo.
The Lamp (January). Garrison, N.Y.
Revue des Jeunes (January). Paris: 3 Rue de Luynes.
The Book of Saints. Compiled by the Benedictine Monks of Ramsgate.
 London: A. & C. Black.

THE IRISH NUNS OF LISBON

OUR LADY OF BOM SUCESSO

BY RIGHT REV. MGR. D. J. O'DOHERTY

FEW Irish people, I venture to think, have an idea of what an agreeable surprise awaits them on their first visit to the ancient kingdom of Portugal, so near, so easy of access, yet so different from Ireland, and, for the matter of that, from all the countries of Europe, even its nearest neighbour, Spain. At all seasons of the year, the climate of Portugal is ideal. There one does not meet the extremes of cold and heat which make the Castilian plateau during the greater part of the year unpleasant for an Irishman. The scenery is richer, the vegetation more abundant, and the inhabitants, even the most highly placed, seem to have imbibed the softer mood of their climate and country. Volumes might be written on the *spirituelle* feasts that are in store for the art-lover and the antiquarian in Coimbra, with its ancient Cathedral, Episcopal Museum, and famed University, in Braga, in Evora, in Batalha, and in Lisbon; but I pass them all over to treat as briefly as I can of the glories of an institution that must be dear to the heart of every Irishman, the ancient Convent of Irish Nuns, Bom Successo, in Lisbon.

Bom Successo is a convent of Dominican Nuns of the Second Order, founded in the year 1639. The community was in the beginning strictly contemplative and most observant, not only of the rules and constitutions of the Order, but of a number of additional regulations laid down by its founder with the approbation of the Portuguese Provincial of the Order. Meat was never used, except in cases of serious illness. Disciplines were frequent. Divine Office was recited every day in choir, and the Enclosure was

strictly observed. So strict was the observance and so rigorous the life of this holy community, that the health of the Sisters suffered, and many of the most promising, we are told, went to an early grave, with the result that the superiors very properly interfered in favour of less rigour and fewer austerities. Still, even now, the Enclosure is strictly kept, the constitutions are faithfully observed, the Divine Office is daily recited in choir, and all the other pious exercises of an observant community are religiously practised. Indeed, the only notable difference in the regulations consists in the fact that the community is no longer contemplative, but with the necessities of the times has become active.

THE FOUNDER AND THE FOUNDATION

Any account, however brief, of the foundation of this historic Irish convent, perhaps the oldest we have, would be incomplete without a reference to the extraordinary career of its real founder,¹ the learned O'Daly, who, according to Baronius, was 'the admiration of Louvain, of Madrid, of France, and of practically all Europe.'

Born in 1595 of a noble Kerry family, his name in the world was Daniel O'Daly, but he is better known as Dominic O'Daly or Domingo del Rosario, which was the name given him by his brethren of the Order of St. Dominic in Lugo, Spain.² For some time he filled the Chairs of Philosophy and Theology in the Dominican College of Burgos, whence he went to take up missionary work in Ireland, but after a short period he returned to collegiate work, becoming a professor in Louvain. Later, he was sent on a mission for his Order to the Spanish Court at Madrid, and there formed the project of establishing a college in Portugal, at the time under Spanish rule, where young Irishmen should be trained as Dominicans to help to preserve the faith in their native land. His efforts, thanks to his influence with the

¹ Vide Introduction to Father Meehan's translation of O'Daly's *Geraldines*.

² Father Meehan says he made his noviciate in Tralee, loc. cit.

Spanish Court, were successful, so much so that his foundation, the Dominican College of Corpo Santo, after three hundred years of glorious work, still flourishes and is one of our Irish *possessions abroad* in which we may take a legitimate pride, for it enjoys a unique reputation amongst devout people of all classes and ranks in Lisbon. Father O'Daly closed his long and arduous life of professor, missionary, councillor and envoy of kings,¹ preacher, author, and founder in 1662, as Bishop-Elect of Coimbra, having previously refused the offers made to him of two other dioceses. His honoured remains await, as we may piously hope, a glorious resurrection in the exquisite church of Corpo Santo, founded by him.

The Nuns of Bom Sucesso have, therefore, reason to be proud of their founder. Like so many other Irish exiles, he was filled with pity for the down-trodden condition of his native land, and being consulted by a pious Portuguese lady, the Countess d'Atalia, as to the nature of the religious use she should make of some of her great wealth, suggested that nothing could be more meritorious than to found in Lisbon a convent for Irish ladies of noble birth, where they could peacefully follow their vocations of becoming religious, a happiness which persecution denied them at home. The good lady was won by the charitable work, and at once set about carrying it into effect.

But the greatest difficulty was yet to be overcome, for the royal permission had to be obtained. Now the King lived in Madrid, many hundreds of miles away, and kings at that time were absolute monarchs. But Father O'Daly, nothing daunted, undertook the long and perilous journey. He was an old traveller, and probably had faith in his Irish powers of persuasion. It must have been a surprise to him to find the King, Philip IV, generally such a staunch and consistent friend of Ireland, hard to deal with. The MS. history of Bom Sucesso, preserved in the convent, informs

¹ Amongst other embassies, he was twice sent by King John IV of Portugal as his envoy to France, and once, at least, he went to the Emperor.

us that the King made his consent conditional on two hundred Irishmen being brought from Ireland to act as his bodyguard. Father O'Daly had little hope of succeeding, but so strong were his desires to see the foundation realized that he set out for Ireland. He was successful and returned to Spain with his two hundred volunteers.

As to what follows, I can only leave each reader to form his own opinion. According to the MS. just referred to, the King on seeing at the foot of his throne the two hundred Irish lads—they were 'splendid missile troops,' no doubt—vowed that until he got as many more of the same he would not give his consent to the establishment of a convent of Irish ladies at Lisbon. Father O'Daly went to Ireland again, and got the required troops, and the royal playboy gave his right royal consent. As a result of all of which the convent was founded and the devout Sisters to the present day state that their 'convent was purchased with Irish blood.' Would that Irish blood had always been as efficacious!¹

The then country residence of the Countess was enlarged, and no expense spared in fitting it up for the new community. The foundress, as often happened in those days, retained two rooms and an oratory for her own use, though with a separate entrance. The church was planned by a niece of the Countess, a young lady who afterwards by special permission was permitted to join the community, and indeed became its second Prioress. This young lady also presented the new foundation with the enormous solid silver throne on which the tabernacle of the High Altar still rests. It is an exquisite and priceless work, with numerous figures and groups in hammered silver, unique even in a country like Portugal, famous for its sacred vessels and church ornaments.

Two miraculous happenings are narrated concerning the Titular of the convent and church—one by which the institution was dedicated to Our Lady of Good Success (Boni Successus), in honour of her joyful and virginal

¹ The Sisters say that descendants of some of these soldiers who settled down in Spain used to visit the convent.

delivery, and the other by which the Countess received a suitable statue of Our Lady under that title from two pilgrims of whom nothing was known either before or after. Through all its vicissitudes the community has faithfully preserved this beautiful statue to which there is an extraordinary devotion in all that part of Portugal, where it is not unusual to have it brought to the houses of its devotees.

The following is a translation of the quaint prayer to Our Lady of Good Success: 'Our Lady, our Queen, our Mother, in the name of Jesus and for the love of Jesus, we implore thee to take our cause in hands and grant it good success.' The good Sisters declare that many miracles have been wrought by its recital.

SAINTLY IRISH LIVES

All through its history the community has been distinctively Irish and in the beginning the language of the Sisters, who were all of noble descent, was Irish, the community prayers being said for many years in the native tongue.

We regret not to be able to give the family names of all those early religious who left all things, country and kindred and father's home, to follow Christ. What we do know is that soon the new foundation had its full quota of forty Sisters, and that ever since it has flourished in a wonderful way. The religious names of many of the Sisters remarkable for their asceticism and great sanctity are preserved, but there is no special interest attaching to such a list.

We have, however, the family name and history of two of the earliest, and these, for many reasons, are interesting. Sister Catherine of the Rosary, and her cousin, Ursula Burke, were received about 1640, and are regarded as the first postulants of the convent. We are told that Father O'Daly met these two young ladies on his visit to Ireland and accepted them as postulants, leaving them in charge of Father James O'Hurley, then Provincial of the Irish Dominicans and later Bishop of Emly, and a relative of these ladies.

Father Lucas de Santa Catharina, in the *Historia de S. Domingos*, gives the history of Sister Catherine. Her name in the world was also Catherine.¹ She was a daughter of John Burke, lord of Brittas in the County of Limerick, and of Grace Thornton, a daughter of Sir George Thornton, Marshall of Munster. John Burke was condemned to death because he refused to surrender a priest to a troop of soldiers who surrounded his house. He had fought his way safely through them, carrying with him the altar-stone and the sacred vessels. He made a most edifying statement to those who gathered to witness his execution in the year 1606, and was regarded by many as a martyr.² Father Lucas goes on to tell us that his only son and heir had gone to Spain to study when very young, but died there. It is curious that the Archives of the Irish College, Salamanca, state that the father of one of the students had suffered death for the faith, and in a list of students drawn up in 1611 we find the name, 'Gulielmus Burke, filius Joannis, Diocesis Limbricensis.' Was this William Burke the son of John of Brittas and brother to our Sister Catherine?

Sister Catherine was not born at the time of her father's judicial murder, but the good man had expressed the fervent wish that the child, whether boy or girl, should in due time assume the habit of St. Dominic. Notwithstanding the opposition of some members of her family, Sister Catherine, as we have seen, carried out her father's last wish. Her life in religion was short, but characterized by a most remarkable spirit of prayer and mortification. One of her sayings is worthy of note. Being asked what method she followed in prayer, she answered that she knew nothing about methods, the only thing she could do was to say her Rosary, 'one mystery of which was enough to occupy the longest life.' It is said that she foretold the day of her death, and that some time after, when her body was being

¹ Mrs. O'Connell, *For Faith and Fatherland* (Gill, Dublin, 1888), gives it as Eleanor.

² All this is also narrated in the Salamanca College Archives in a contemporary document. John Burke figures in the list of Irish martyrs here.

transferred from the choir to the chapter-room, it seemed to exhale an odour of flowers and to be still untouched by decay.

From the *Hibernia Dominicana* we learn that the Prioress in 1760 was Josepha Plunkett, and amongst the other names of Sisters mentioned are MacCarthy, O'Kennedy, O'Farrell, O'Byrne, Morrogh, MacCrohan, Tuite, and O'Cleary. The community is as Irish to-day as it ever was, and the large majority of the Sisters are still of our race, as were both the Mothers Prioress and Sub-Prioress when we had the pleasure of visiting the convent a short time ago.

TRIALS AND PERSECUTION

The convent did not escape the terrible earthquake of 1755, but the comparatively little damage it suffered, standing as it did on the very shore of the bay, is evidence of the special protection of Divine Providence. Not one of the inhabitants was injured although the massive iron grating of the choir was dashed to the ground and the belfry was thrown down.

From the restoration of the Portuguese Monarchy, the convent was highly esteemed and honoured by the royal family, many of whom were its benefactors and loved to visit it, but since the decline of the Monarchy, the community has suffered much and has been more than once on the point of extinction. When the French occupied Portugal and King John VI retired to Brazil, the Sisters thought of accepting his kindly offer of protection and a home there. In 1823 the convent was actually suppressed in the general confiscation of religious property, and the Nuns were driven from their home, while their treasured belongings were auctioned before their eyes. They were able to save very little, but this little included the venerated statue of the Patroness and the silver throne of the High Altar. The storm soon passed over, however, and, although with much difficulty, the Irish Nuns were allowed back to their beloved convent. Tradition describes the dismantled condition in which they found it, everything that had not

been sold had been carried off or destroyed,¹ but they rejoiced exceedingly to be able to renew their community life, and, ever since, the 25th June—the day of their return—is a day of thanksgiving, on which they have permission to celebrate the Feast of Our Lady of Good Success with a Plenary Indulgence. Again, in 1833, the storm of *liberal* persecution broke loose and the Nuns were actually placed under arrest and informed that they should have to return to Ireland. On this, as on a number of later occasions, the convent was saved from extinction by the fact of its being a foreign institution, and on this account in the more recent period the community has been quite undisturbed.

PRESENT-DAY ACTIVITIES

It is not necessary to dwell on the nature of the institution, as most of us are familiar with it in the Dominican Convents of Drogheda and Galway. The community of Bom Sucesso is under the immediate jurisdiction of the General of the Order of Friar-Preachers and is quite independent of all other houses of Dominican Nuns, though it naturally maintains most cordial relations with the sister-institutions in Drogheda, Cabra, and Galway, from which, I understand, it has received frequent assistance during the last fifty years.

In the educational work to which the Irish Convent of Lisbon has recently dedicated itself, we see an example of the wonderful working of Divine Providence. Portugal, like the other Catholic countries of Europe, was in evil days a refuge for our persecuted forefathers, and our boys were made welcome not only at the famed national University of Coimbra,² but like the Irish Dominicans—Priests and Sisters—were as early as 1595 given a home and college in Lisbon. Pious Portuguese Catholics of all classes loved to help these worthy foundations, yet not one of that

¹ This accounts for the lack of early records.

² As late as the seventies of the eighteenth century the professor of Greek was an Irishman, Dr. Wm. Birmingham, later Rector of the Irish College, Salamanca.

long line of benefactors could foresee that one at least of these foundations would pay back in kind Ireland's debt, and in a way that must be most pleasing to those benefactors.

The Catholic Church has fallen on evil days in Portugal. In that once Catholic land there is no such thing as a Catholic school, and religion is prohibited in its educational centres. There is one and but one exception.¹ It is the large and flourishing boarding-school of secondary education for girls now kept by the Irish Sisters of Bom Sucesso, which in a few years has won for itself a splendid reputation, and where girls of the best families go for their education. It is a great light shining in the darkness, a light of which we Irish Catholics may well feel proud, for it is kept aloft by Irish faith and Irishwomen's courage. We are also thankful to Providence which so permits us to pay back some at least of the debt we owe to former benefactors.

The convent of these good Sisters of St. Dominic, consisting of an extensive group of massive buildings, with a beautiful church and large gardens, is spread out on the very verge of the wide-flowing Tagus and towards the western extremity of the suburbs of Lisbon. There are spacious halls, corridors and refectory, all richly furnished and in the best taste. The gardens are amongst the most beautiful we have seen in that flower-land of riotous colouring. Let us hope that this monument to our national greatness may long flourish and that Irish vocations will not be wanting to continue the good work. 'There is always a hearty welcome,' said the Mother Prioress, 'for suitable Irish postulants.'

D. J. O'DOHERTY.

¹ Of course there are private schools where religion is occultly taught.

ETERNAL LIFE

BY THE BISHOP OF SEBASTOPOLIS

VI

It must be so—*Plato* thou reason'st well—
Else whence this pleasing hope, this fond desire,
This longing after Immortality ?
Or whence this secret dread, and inward horror,
Of falling into naught ? Why shrinks the soul
Back on herself, and startles at destruction ?
'Tis the divinity that stirs within us ;
'Tis heav'n itself that points out an hereafter,
And intimates eternity to man.

Reason informs me I shall never die.
The soul, secur'd in her existence, smiles
At the drawn dagger, and defies its point.
The stars shall fade away, the sun himself
Grow dim with age, and nature sink in years ;
But thou shalt flourish in immortal youth,
Unhurt amidst the war of elements,
The wrecks of matter, and the crush of worlds.

J. ADDISON.

TO die is quite as natural as to be born. And there is, from many points of view, a great similarity between birth and death. Both involve a sudden and a radical change. Both experiences are attended with some degree of pain ; both mark the passage from a less to a more perfect condition of life, and both introduce us into a fuller and a more extended field of action. If a man could think and reason during the months of his pre-natal existence, he would probably imagine the life of which he now has experience to be the only life he will ever enjoy, and that the cataclysm of birth will mean for him annihilation. Yet, in the fullness of time, he emerges into a world far more wonderful and far more beautiful than anything he ever dreamed of ; an experience, indeed, for which the previous

months of his existence have been nothing more than a necessary preparation. So is it with that final birth, which we call death. Though we may fear it, and imagine it to be the final end of our existence, yet it is, in truth, but the natural means by which we are ushered into yet another world, immeasurably more wonderful and beautiful than that into which our first birth admitted us. In fact, in this sense, we may surely say :—

There is no death ! What seems so
is transition ;
This life of mortal breath is but a suburb
of the life Elysian
Whose portal we call death.

Catholics, at all events, know that to one who has served God loyally, death is nothing more than the dark and dreaded entry into a new world of such untold glory and splendour, as to beggar all description.

So soon as he grows conscious of his immortality, man realizes that the present life is nothing more than a passing incident in a career which can have no end, and he awaits the next stage with immense interest and with the brightest expectations.

Since death is a punishment and a penalty justly inflicted by God on man, on account of sin, it is only right and just that he should stand in some fear of it ; and, so long as men are in health, this fear is generally acknowledged. But when the moment of departure from this world actually draws near, this fear, in almost every case, disappears. Cardinal Manning's explanation of the phenomenon was a very simple one. He said to me one day, when conversing on the subject : ' The reason, I take it, is this : so long as God *intends a man to live*, He instils into him the fear of death ; when He *intends him to die*, He mercifully withdraws this fear, so that most persons, at the very last, deliver up their souls into the hands of God, as peacefully and as calmly as a healthy child composes himself to sleep.'

I have questioned scores of priests, and doctors and nurses, and they have all assured me that their experience

has been much the same, though they did not offer the explanation offered by the Cardinal. Dr. Robert W. Mackenna writes :—

Personally, I have never seen anyone about to die evince the slightest fear of the impending change, and this experience is supported by a great body of weighty medical opinion. Sir Benjamin Brodie, who a century ago was the acknowledged *doyen* of surgery in England, has left the following record in one of his conversational essays : ‘ I have myself never known but two instances in which, in the act of dying, there were manifest indications of the fear of death.’ Now, Brodie was a man of very wide experience, which ranged through every social grade, from Windsor Castle to the slums of London, and in his day he must have seen many people die. But only two—an infinitesimal proportion of the whole—showed fear.¹

I have fought with death [writes Dr. Mackenna], and lost the battle, over the beds of young men and women in the first flush of maturity ; I have seen strong men and women cut down in their prime ; I have watched the old totter down the slope, into the twilight, and at the end fall asleep like little children, and I say it, with a due sense of the importance of the statement, that my experience has been that, however much men and women may, when in the full vigour of health, fear death, when their hour approaches the fear is almost invariably lulled into quietness, and they face the end with calmness and a serene mind.²

Dr. Mackenna reports many instances. I will quote just one : ‘ A young man who fell from the roof of a lofty building and escaped miraculously, with a handful of bruises, assured me that, in his long fall to earth, which seemed to cover an eternity, he did not feel the slightest fear ; and I have been told by three medical men, each of whom narrowly escaped drowning under *entirely different circumstances*, that when their fate seemed certain, all fear was taken from them.’³ ‘ If I had strength enough to hold a pen,’ said Dr. W. Hunter, just before he expired, ‘ I would write down how easy and pleasant a thing it is to die.’ Another celebrated physician, Sir J. F. Goodhart, who made a *special study of death scenes*, gives his experiences, in the following words : ‘ I am never tired of saying, because I am sure it is as true as it is comforting, although in opposition to the general belief, that death has no terror

¹ See *The Adventure of Death*, pp. 70, 71.

² *Ibid.* p. 63.

³ *Ibid.* p. 67.

for the sick man. There is nothing terrible to the dying in death itself. The veil between the two worlds is but a cloud, and one passes through it imperceptibly.’¹

If such be the case with ordinary men, whose lives are marked by no special piety and holiness, it is far truer still of those whose vivid faith and personal worthiness have been much above the average. The Saint and the devout and loyal servant of God, who has pondered over the inspired words of Holy Scripture, and whose mind is filled with thoughts of the wonderful rewards which God has prepared for those who love Him, not only meets death with calmness and resignation, but often with a great longing and an intense joy.

He feels that, in spite of many imperfections and daily faults, he has honestly and sincerely striven to live for God alone. He has unbounded confidence in the infinite compassion, mercy and pity of his divine Master, and he knows that He desires his salvation more even than he does himself, and that he will grant forgiveness of his faults of surprise, of frailty, and weakness, more readily than he is ready to ask forgiveness. And lying there, on his death-bed at last, he feels the greatest confidence, for he knows Whom he has trusted, and he firmly believes that Christ, Who died for him, amid such atrocious tortures, will now stretch forth His divine arms to welcome him as a son redeemed by His precious Blood, and receive him into eternal rest, as the choice fruit of His sacred Passion.

On one occasion, St. Teresa, while suffering great pain, expressed herself as follows : ‘The pain seems to me sharp enough to cause death ; *only I do not deserve it*. All my anxiety at these times is that I should die ; I do not think of Purgatory, nor of the great sins I have committed, and by which I have deserved hell. I forget everything, in my eagerness to see God.’² ‘Oh,’ she exclaims, on another occasion, ‘sometimes I consider, if a person like myself frequently feels her banishment so much, what the feelings

¹ *The Adventure of Death*, p. 72.

² *Life*, p. 149.

of the Saints must have been. What must St. Paul and the Magdalene, and others like them have suffered, in whom the fire of the love of God had grown so strong. *Their life must have been a continual martyrdom.*¹ When at last (some years later) she lay on her death-bed, her heart began to overflow with joy, at the prospect of being united with God. When the Viaticum was brought to her, she could scarcely contain herself. Her biographer records that

In spite of her extreme exhaustion, which for two days had prevented her making the slightest movement, she raised herself in bed to a kneeling posture, and would have knelt on the ground unless she had been prevented. Her look became inflamed, her face lit up with a heavenly brightness, and her whole being was transformed. Then, with a loud and vibrating voice, she cried, 'Oh! my Lord, and my well beloved Spouse! The longed-for hour is arrived. It is time we should see each other. Oh! my Saviour and my only love, it is time to depart; it is time I should go out of this life. Blessed a thousand times be this hour, and may Thy will be accomplished. Yes; the hour is arrived when my soul shall go to Thee, to be united to Thee, after waiting for Thee so long.'²

Her agony began without groans, or sighs, or sufferings; joyous, as if rapt in ecstasy, she lay in her Saviour's arms, waiting for the moment when Heaven should open to receive her. . . . The little cell had become a place of paradise. An ever increasing brightness dwelt on the saint's countenance. Her features were invested with a supernatural beauty. The rays of light which encircled her forehead, the crimson on her cheeks, the unutterable joy of her expression, were all divine. God was present there, and His beloved already enjoyed a foretaste of the joys of the blessed. Towards nine in the evening three gentle sighs escaped her, so soft that they resembled rather those made by a person absorbed in prayer, than one in her agony, and she gave up her soul to God.³

We have another illustration, in the death of St. Peter of Alcantara.

When he knew that the most holy Viaticum was coming, although weakened, and like a paralytic unable to move, he threw himself at once, without any assistance, on his knees, and with clasped hands and incredible fervour of spirit, worshipped the Blessed Sacrament, and received it with the greatest veneration, with tears and holy awe, and begged that at the proper time he might receive the most holy sacrament

¹ *Life*, p. 161.

² Deposition made by Sister Mary of St. Francis. V. de la Fuente.

³ *Life*, p. 603.

of Extreme Unction. Then, fixing his eyes on the crucifix, with a serene countenance, and his spirit as it were on fire, he remained for some time in profound repose, in an ecstasy, and absorbed in God. When the physician came, the dying man asked him: When will the longed-for time come, and the hour when I shall be delivered from this destruction, and shall enter on the way of life? The physician replied: Father, that hour will soon come, it is now drawing nigh. When the holy man heard this, he was affected with unutterable joy, and turning exultingly to God, he repeated with a joyous look the words of the royal prophet, I rejoiced at the things that were said to me; we shall go into the house of the Lord.¹

When Cardinal Wiseman was on his death-bed, he is reported to have said that he had no misgivings, but that he felt full of joy, *'like a school boy going home.'* And we have all, no doubt, heard of the great theologian Suarez's last words. Though during life, he had almost an abnormal fear of death, yet, when it was actually on him, he smiled, and his whole face lit up, as he exclaimed: *'Oh! I little thought how sweet a thing it is to die.'* A few years ago, a holy religious, whose name I am not at liberty to give, was dying, and I am assured by one who was present, that one of his companions talking quietly to him, after he had just received Extreme Unction, asked him if he were not terrified at the thought of meeting our Divine Lord? Upon which he seemed to be quite astonished, and replied: *'What? Terrified to meet Our Lord? Afraid to meet Him Whom I have served and laboured for, during the past forty years, and Who is charity itself? What? Afraid to meet Him; certainly not; I would be much more afraid to meet the Provincial!'*

Death may be regarded from two very different points of view. If, on the one hand, it is (1) a punishment of sin inflicted by the justice of God, on the other hand, it is (2) the especially appointed and only means of attaining true bliss, and of reaching the sublime end, for which we have been created. Considered from the first point of view, it is quite right and proper that we should fear and dread its approach. But, considered from the second point of view,

¹ Vide Report of the Auditors of the Rota.

we should look forward to it as our friend and deliverer. As Rev. J. Nieremberg, S.J., so quaintly remarks :—

Death is a rare invention of God's mercy, for it easeth us of all molestations of this life, and takes away an eternity of miseries. Just consider what a painful thing it would be if we were for all eternity subject to the necessities of rising daily and of going to bed, of eating and drinking, of cold and heat, of toil and sickness, of seeking our sustenance, of carking and caring, of suffering affronts, or spending our whole life in sordid and laborious drudgery. Many that were notoriously wicked sought death, and made away with themselves, merely to avoid these inconveniences. At least, let us not dread this passage to a future felicity (p. 378).

Indeed, 'death is so great a good, and so proper and secure an effect of God's goodness, that He would not leave it within the power of man's free will, or place it within the power of an enemy to hinder it. For, although it be *in anyone's power to deprive thee of life*, yet nobody, no, *not even the uncontrollable violence of kings, can deprive thee of death!* . . . Many, for a mere punctilio of worldly glory, have sought and coveted it; at least, for the glory of Heaven, let us not fear it' (p. 379). To the hardened sinner, it is, of course, a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God. But to one who has always been solicitous about his salvation, and who is serving God loyally, nothing could be more desirable.

As the love of God [observes Père Grou] is their principal employment here, they see in the passage from this life, only a happy change, which will assure to them the possession of God, and the ineffable bliss of loving Him for all eternity. It is not that they have a positive assurance of their salvation, but they have a firm faith and trust in God, and their conscience bears witness to their constant fidelity to Him. . . . They know that it is Christ who will be their Judge, and they say to themselves: Why should I fear Him Who has given me so many graces, Who has preserved me from sin, or raised me up again, when I had fallen into it. Who inspired me with the desire of giving myself entirely to Him, Whom I love more than I love myself, and Whom I wish to love until my last breath.¹

To a soul in grace and free from all attachment to sin, what is death but the flinging open of his prison gates, the

¹ *Manl. for Int. Souls*, p. 246.

breaking of all earthly barriers, and the setting of the captive free? What indeed is death, but the sweet voice of the heavenly Bridegroom, inviting His spouse, the redeemed and glorified soul, to the heavenly nuptials? When the cold sweat of death bedews the brow, and the last moments approach, and the ear grows insensible and closes to all earthly sounds, it will open to the soft silvery echoes reaching it from another Land; and the departing soul will cry out in the hidden depths of its being: 'Behold, my Beloved speaketh to me: Arise, make haste, my love, my dove, my beautiful one, and COME. Winter (the winter of sin and of all spiritual bleakness and barrenness) is now past; the rain (the rain of trial, tribulation, and temptation) is over and gone; and the flowers (flowers of virtue and holiness) have appeared in the land. . . . My beloved to me, and I to Him, who feedeth among the lilies.'¹ Oh! who would wish to tarry a moment longer in this cold, dreary, dismal land of exile, when once the entrancing voice of the Beloved is heard calling him away to the inexpressible delights of Heaven, and to the 'Nuptials of the Lamb'? Surely in an ecstasy of joy he will cry out: 'I have found Him, whom my soul loveth; I hold Him, and I will not let Him go.'²

Although no one has ever come back, to describe for us the sensations of passing from Time to Eternity, yet all the indications tend to show that there is no real pain. 'The pangs of birth are the mother's; the child, in all likelihood, does not suffer during its entry into the world, for its delicate organization could not survive such an ordeal. And so it is not unlikely that when the end comes, and we throw off life like a garment, *we too shall feel no pain.*'³ Then, when we have passed the barrier, and pause, as it were on the threshold of our new home, what will be our first sensations? On this subject, Cardinal Newman makes

¹ Canticle of Canticles, chap. ii.

² Ibid. iii. 4.

³ *The Adventure of Death*, p. 91.

some apposite observations, which it may be interesting to quote.

When [observes the Cardinal] we have wound up our minds for any point of time, any great event, or interview with strangers, or the sight of some wonder, or the occasion of some unusual trial, when it comes, and is gone, we have a strange reverse of feeling from our changed circumstances. Such—but without any mixture of pain, without any lassitude, dullness, or disappointment—may be the happy contemplation of the disembodied spirit; as if it said to itself, 'So now all is over; this is what I have so long waited for; for which I have nerved myself; against which I have prepared, fasted, prayed, and wrought righteousness. Death is come and gone—it is over. Ah! Is it possible! What an easy trial, what a cheap price for eternal glory! A few sharp sicknesses, or some acute pain awhile, or some few and evil years, or some struggles of mind, dreary desolateness for a season, fightings and fears, afflicting bereavements, or the scorn and ill usage of the world—how they fretted me, how much I thought of them, how little really they are! Oh! how contemptible a thing is human life—contemptible in itself, yet in its effect invaluable! For it has been to me like a small seed of easy purchase, germinating into bliss everlasting.'¹

Pursuing much the same thought, but on a totally different occasion, the Cardinal continues in the following strain:—

Blessed are they who shall at length behold what as yet mortal eye hath not seen and faith only enjoys. . . . Who can express the surprise and rapture which will come upon those who then at last apprehend them for the first time, and to whose perceptions they are new. Who can imagine by a stretch of fancy the feelings of those who having died in faith, wake up to enjoyment! The life then begun, we know, will last for ever; yet surely if memory be to us then what it is now, that will be a day much to be observed unto the Lord through all the ages of eternity. We may increase indeed for ever in knowledge and in love, still that first awaking from the dead, the day at once of our birth and our espousals, will ever be endeared and hallowed in our thoughts. When we find ourselves after a long rest gifted with fresh powers, vigorous with the seed of eternal life within us, able to love God as we wish, conscious that all trouble, sorrow, pain, anxiety, bereavement, is over for ever, blessed in the full affection of those earthly friends, whom we loved so poorly, and could protect so feebly, while they were with us in the flesh, and above all, visited by the immediate visible ineffable Presence of Almighty God, with His Only-begotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ, and His Coequal, Coeternal Spirit, that great sight in which is the fullness of joy and pleasure for evermore—what deep, incommunicable, unimaginable thoughts will be then upon us! What depths will be stirred up

¹ Newman's Sermon on 'The Greatness and Littleness of Human Life,' p. 345.

within us ! What secret harmonies awakened, of which human nature seemed incapable ! Earthly words are indeed all worthless to minister to such high anticipations.¹

From the musing of Cardinal Newman, we may pass to the following comforting words of another great Cardinal :—

In our eternal home, there will be no distinctions of ranks, no divisions of classes of society [writes Cardinal Wiseman], but all who have passed the threshold will be on a footing of equality in affection and charity. Is it possible, my God, that I shall one day be so highly honoured by those whom Thou hast so exalted ? Shall Thy glorious Saints, shall Thy blessed Angels condescend to recognize and treat a poor wretch like me, as a dear and long-tried friend, and as one worthy of their intimacy, familiarity, and love ? . . . Reflect how the countless multitude of the Angels and Saints will be no impediment to this intercourse of charity. When we are introduced to a great banquet on earth, our conversation is necessarily limited to the few individuals more immediately about us ; we see the others only from a distance. But between spirits and spiritualized bodies, distance and multitude will be no hindrance to uninterrupted communion. They require not to be near one another in order to converse together ; they have no need of individual friendships, or secret and reserved communications. We may form some idea of their intercourse by imagining them to ourselves as so many mirrors placed around the sun, which is God. Each of them reflects in itself the rays of all the others, and sends to them all its own images ; and yet both the reflected and the reflector have only one object, viz., the sun, which gives them all light and heat, which multiplies itself as many fold as there are mirrors, and represents itself in each as many times as there are others that receive its figure. For, what have the Blessed to say and express but what is in God, Who is all knowledge and wisdom, and Who, shining upon every one of His elect, makes in him the representation of Himself, in which he sees all that the others see, know, and feel, and by which he at once sends to, and receives from them all faithful transcripts and representations of their common happiness. . . . The acquaintance and close friendship which we shall make with the Blessed, will not be a work of time, or a feeling of gradual growth, but complete from the first instant. The very first moment of admission into their company will give the key to the thoughts and affections of all, and place each and all in the complete equality of communion. Oh ! what a paradise of delights must Heaven be, where such an unimaginable participation of happiness is constantly carried on, where each one has nothing that is not the property of all, and where millions of souls contribute the sum of inconceivable bliss to form the portion of each.²

¹ Newman's Sermon on 'The Invisible World,' pp. 229, 230.

² Vide Card. Wiseman's *Meditations*, pp. 306-7.

There is no better way of preparing for Eternity than by thinking of it and by keeping it before our minds.

Although I am always in perfect health [writes Rev. J. P. Caussade, S.J.], I feel that the years, so rapidly passing, will *soon* bring me to that eternal goal, to which we are all hastening. True! This thought is bitter to nature, but by dint of considering it as salutary it becomes almost agreeable, as a disgusting remedy gradually ceases to appear so when its good effects have been experienced. One of my friends said, the other day, that in getting old it seemed to him time passed with increasing rapidity, and that weeks seemed to him as short as days used to be, months like weeks, and years like months. As to that, what do a few years more or less signify to us, who have to live and continue as long as God Himself? Those who have gone before us twenty or thirty years ago, or even a century, or those who will follow us twenty or thirty years hence, will neither be behindhand nor before others, in that vast Eternity; but it will seem to all of us as though we began it together. Oh! what power does not this thought contain to soften the rigours of our short and miserable life, which, patiently endured, will be to our advantage. A longer or a shorter life, a little more or a little less pain, what is it in comparison with the eternal life that awaits us? for which we are making rapidly, incessantly, and which is almost in sight, for me especially, who am, as it were, on the brink, and on the point of embarking.¹

The supernal joys and delights of our heavenly Home have been depicted again and again by gifted and saintly writers. And although these entrancing word-pictures, which have been painted for our delectation, often possess a depth of beauty that ravishes the mind and sets the heart on fire, and although their contemplation is exceedingly useful and stimulating, and well calculated to stir us up and to instil a strong and insatiable longing in our hearts, yet we must ever bear in mind that even the very best and choicest of these descriptions falls infinitely short of the transcendent truth. The most sublime and exquisite representations that can be set before us, in the most eloquent and glowing language, to excite our thirst and to arouse our desires, is, after all, nothing better than a rude and clumsy sketch of the tremendous reality. Not one of these conceptions, however beautiful, ever sins by excess, but every one of them sins, and sins grievously, by defect.

¹ See *Abandonment to Divine Providence*, pp. 176-7.

For we know full well, that when the utmost has been said, it has not come anywhere near the full truth, and that even the wisest and the holiest, in attempting the fruitless task, does but stammer and mutter like a little child, in its first attempts to articulate.

Yet, if even such hopelessly inadequate attempts are so powerful to awaken desire and to enflame the affections, what—let us ask ourselves—must be the effect of the unapproachable and infinite reality, when at last it bursts upon us, in all its inconceivable beauty and perfection! God grant that, on that eventful day, we may find ourselves among the elect, and that we may not then see the bright vision vanishing for ever from before our eyes, and the gates of hell opening to receive us instead. Yet it rests with ourselves. ‘BEFORE MAN IS LIFE AND DEATH: GOOD AND EVIL: THAT WHICH HE SHALL CHOOSE SHALL BE GIVEN TO HIM.’¹ Oh! what a responsibility rests upon our poor weak shoulders!

‘Unam petii a Domino, hanc requiram; ut inhabitem in domo Domini omnibus diebus vitæ meæ.’²

✠ JOHN S. VAUGHAN.

[*To be continued.*]

¹ Ecclesiasticus xv. 18.

² Psalm xxvi.

A POSTSCRIPT ON THE SOUPER PROBLEM

BY REV. M. H. MACINERNEY, O.P.

MY article on the Souper problem in the August number of this journal attracted more attention than I had ventured to hope for. It gave rise to a considerable volume of comment, and involved me in a mass of correspondence. The comment, in the main, apart from some exceptional cases, was distinctly helpful and encouraging. The correspondence may be left to speak for itself. A venerable priest, whose name is well known in Ireland and beyond seas, wrote from the diocese of Derry:—

I congratulate you with all my heart on your article on the Souper problem in this month's I. E. RECORD. I hope the article will be appreciated as it deserves. It is time a national effort were made to end the Souper scandal. The audacity of the proselytizers knows no bounds. In my boyhood, an effort was made to found a Maternity Home in Derry. One of the proposed rules was that *no unmarried clergyman* should be permitted to visit. Our then Bishop, Dr. Kelly, strongly denounced the proposed Home—and there was a collapse. For years there was a Penitentiary in Derry, and one of its rules excluded unmarried clergy from visiting. Thank God, that Penitentiary is now a thing of the past, and the Good Shepherd Nuns are now in Derry.

To prevent a possible misconception, it may be well to state clearly that the Good Shepherd Nuns, like the Sisters of Mercy and the Sisters of Charity, do not cater at present for unmarried mothers and their offspring. Their Refuges befriend fallen women, who have been 'on the streets'; they admit *perichitanti*, or young girls who have not gone astray, but have been rescued from dangerous surroundings. Their Industrial Schools give a sound religious training to little girls who have been left without proper parental control. But these admirable Sisterhoods have no institutions, at

present, for the protection of 'girls in trouble.' That great branch of social work is sadly neglected in Ireland. Hence the leakage which we all deplore, but which we are so slow to remedy.

That the clergy are eager to find an effective and statesmanlike remedy, is suggested by the following letter from a zealous pastor in the Midlands :—

I have read your article in the I. E. RECORD with tears and astonishment. It is a terrible revelation of the sad traffic among the poor fallen girls and their offspring. . . . Your suggestions are really practical, and could easily be carried into effect. . . . The good people, and even the priests, have no idea of the magnitude of the abominable Souperism you so clearly point out. With knowledge of the evil will come properly organized sympathy and support, to establish the Homes you refer to. They are in existence in London, instituted by the late Cardinal Manning, and are superintended by an Order of nuns. I said Mass years ago in one of them.¹ The Workhouse, as you have said, was a safe shelter for many; and until better remedies are adopted, it would be well to have accommodation in the Hospitals in the 'new order' about to be carried out in different Unions. Dublin might give the lead by erecting a large National Home, as many will seek refuge in the city, even though having suitable Diocesan or Union Homes. If you form a Committee, I will guarantee a large subscription from this parish, and will co-operate to the best of my ability in the noble Christian, Catholic movement to 'save the child' and safeguard the faith of the mother.

For more reasons than one, it is not my province to form such a Committee as my respected correspondent desires. As regards the advisability of founding a great National Rescue Home in the vicinity of Dublin, opinions may well be divided. Personally, for reasons stated in my former article, I should prefer to see a sufficient number of small Rescue Homes established throughout the country, and supplemented by a few fairly unobtrusive Homes of similar character in Dublin. A National Rescue Home would inevitably become a species of Workhouse, supported by voluntary subscriptions. In such an institution, the mingling together of hundreds of girls, some innocent and others hardened, would have a demoralizing effect. Besides, the spectacle of hundreds of girls, all in the same plight, would

¹ This was doubtless St. Pelagia's Home, Highgate, of which more anon.

lead even the most innocent to minimize the grievousness of their sin. Smaller Homes, properly graded and not too secluded, would be likely to yield better results. In Dublin we have four Refuges for fallen women. If we had an equal number of Rescue Homes for 'girls in trouble,' and suitable provision made for their children, the Souper problem need trouble us no longer. It would, at least, become dwarfed to insignificance.

A venerable Canon, from somewhere in Ireland, who wishes his name to be rigorously withheld, sends a highly practical letter :—

Your article in the I. E. RECORD, on the Souper problem in Ireland, has induced me to send you the enclosed deposit receipt [£50]. That, with its interest, I hope, will form a nucleus for founding in Dublin a Catholic Foundling Home for children, who otherwise, with their parents, may fall into Protestant hands. You are free to use same as best you can for this purpose. I wish especially that my name should be completely obliterated. Had this Souper business been brought fully and properly before our people and priests, I am sure it would have been taken up.

In my letter of thanks to the generous donor, I informed him that the Mother-General of the Sisters of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary—a Sisterhood whose members are nearly all Irish, and who have twenty-two houses in Great Britain, including St. Pelagia's Home in London, and a similar Rescue Home in Kelton, Woodlands Road, Liverpool—had written to say that her Sisters were eager to undertake rescue work in Ireland, on the lines indicated in my article. I also asked the worthy Canon whether, in strict accordance with his wishes, the money should be held in trust for a future Foundling Home (if such should be established) in Dublin, or whether it might not be better to hand the donation at once to a certain institution. Despite his modesty, my venerable correspondent will forgive me for quoting his reply, which contains some noteworthy suggestions :—

This morning I received your very interesting letter. Thanks be to God for blessing your article, and causing it to produce such fruit as to get the Rev. Mother-General of the Society of Jesus and Mary to take

up the work in Ireland. Don't let it rest here : keep pegging at it. It should be kept before the public. Irish Catholics should not tolerate such a state of things. The limelight should be kept on the Soupers ; and a further step would be to get societies to rescue the unfortunate ones from their evil ways. It occurred to me that, if you made an appeal in the I. E. RECORD to the young priests of Ireland in connection with this, you could show what is done, e.g., in the case of the Maynooth Mission to China. If so many of our young priests are prepared to go to China, the young priests at home might, and ought to, take up an equally meritorious work against the Soupers, and it would not be too much to ask a donation of at least 5s. a quarter from each priest. . . . With regard to my donation, *use it as best you can in honour of the Most Sacred Heart*. I could devise nothing better.

Before turning to communications from across the Irish Sea, it may be well to quote one or two further extracts from letters of priests on the home mission. An excellent parish priest of the diocese of Dublin is a trifle pessimistic, not altogether without reason :—

I read your paper in the I. E. RECORD, which touches *the* blot on the Church in Ireland. For many years I have been in touch with it. Your paper will be read by a few Bishops and priests—and, alas ! will lie there. . . . Could we manage to bring home your facts to the homes of the seducer and his victim ? After all, how many young men and women will see your paper ? Should a similar paper be thrown into a penny pamphlet, and let the boxes be well supplied with them, one booklet would do a whole family. It would do good all round, especially to the parents, who are so anxious to draft off their ignorant children to 'situations' in Dublin. . . . Prevention is better than cure, and many a foolish, ignorant girl would receive a salutary warning. Hoping you may be able to effect something. . . .

A warning of another kind is conveyed in the letter of a Western priest, who had asked for assistance in regard to a particular case :—

For your great charity to the unfortunate victim, I thank you. . . . You are doing a noble act of charity, because I know, after twenty-five years on the mission, that we Irish missionary clergy are too savage on the victims. This case arose through saving a fellow 'on the run' ; and, knowing the girl during the four years I was in the parish, I can only say she was a devout Sodality girl.

Some interesting and important letters came from across Channel. The first of these was from the Mother-General

of the Sisters of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, writing through her secretary :—

Rev. Mother-General read your interesting article in this month's I. E. RECORD on the rescue of unmarried mothers and their babies, and would like to know if there is a possibility of our Order being accepted for that work in Ireland. We have two Homes in England for such cases—St. Pelagia's Home, Highgate, London, opened over 30 years ago; and the House of Providence, Kelton, Liverpool, 25 years in existence. Both have been very successful, and are doing good work. Although, with few exceptions, our Sisters are all Irish, and unfortunately, a number of the poor girls received into the Highgate and Liverpool Homes are Irish, we have no convent in Ireland. We have twenty-two houses in England, Scotland, and Wales. The Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster, and Bishops of dioceses where we have convents, would give the ecclesiastical authorities in Ireland any information required about our Sisters.

Frankly, I had been ignorant of the very existence of these good Sisters. In answer to my request for information regarding the system in vogue in their Rescue Homes, the secretary wrote :—

1. We start with a small capital. Funds are raised by appealing to the public through the Catholic press, and by voluntary contributions, bazaars, etc.

2. Mother and child are received into the Rescue Home for one year. The greater number at their own request remain two, three, or four years, as the case may require. They are employed in laundry, needlework, knitting, and household duties.

3. When possible, we try to get the father to help towards the maintenance, but do not often succeed.

4. Unfortunately, there are no Foundling Homes in connection with the work here. It is a great want. When the mother is placed in a situation, the child is sent to one of our Orphanages, or boarded-out with trustworthy people, the mother paying a weekly or monthly sum out of her salary towards the support of her child. Sometimes the children are adopted by good Catholics.

A few modifications might easily bring this system into harmony with Irish needs. In the first place, the Australian plan for raising funds seems preferable to the English one. A yearly collection in all the churches of a diocese affords the easiest and readiest means of providing funds for a Rescue Home. The collection might be supplemented, whenever necessary, by Press appeals, sales of work, or bazaars.

Secondly, in the great majority of Irish cases, it would

seem neither necessary nor desirable to detain girls in a Rescue Home for a year or two after their confinement. As far as possible, of course, they ought to be detained until their child's life is clearly out of danger. Before their confinement, they may need to spend two or three months in the Home, to escape observation and scandal.

So much being premised, let us get down to the bed-rock facts of the situation. Experience shows that most of the 'girls in trouble' are fairly respectable girls from the country, or perhaps from the city or suburbs, who are filled with a wild terror lest their sin should be detected and talked about. They will go anywhere to hide their shame, and to prevent their misfortune from becoming known to their relatives and neighbours. It is heartrending to witness—as I witnessed an hour ago—a mother's anguish and shame on realizing that her daughter had been betrayed by some worthless rascal. The disgrace to the family is the overwhelming thought that is uppermost in the victim's mind, and in the minds of her relatives, when they happen to become aware of her guilty secret.

These girls, then, come to the city on some pretext or other—to stay awhile with a friend, to undergo hospital treatment, to take up a position, etc. If they are natives of the city or suburbs, they disappear on some similar plea, and hide in some quarter where they are unknown. If they can escape detection, and return home in three or four months, all is well; their good name is saved. If their sin is discovered, they are irretrievably ruined. Those who talk so lightly of the need for compelling these 'girls in trouble' to realize the heinousness of their sin, can have little insight into the psychology of the unhappy victims.

In most cases, therefore, the sooner a girl can leave the Rescue Home, and return to her proper abode with health restored, the better chance she has of saving her reputation. If she remains a year or two in the institution, suspicion will ripen into certainty, and she can hardly ever turn her face homewards again. It seems to me that, if a girl's good name has been shielded, and if a decent home awaits

her, the sooner she is allowed to return home the better. On the other hand, it seems to me that girls who are friendless, girls whose guilt has become definitely known in their native districts, girls drawn from slum tenements, where privacy is almost impossible, girls who come from a rather low stratum of society, and are rude and ignorant—it seems to me that, for their own good, all these might well be detained for a year or more in a Rescue Home.

Thirdly, I venture to affirm that cases of relapse should not be denied admission to a Rescue Home. Such cases are happily rare; at the moment, I can call to mind only two or three. One of them was taken in hand by my Committee early last summer. When the customary web of falsehood was torn away, the girl's identity stood revealed, and her history became known. She was then 'in trouble' for the third time. Her attitude towards those who had befriended her, after the two former escapades, had been far from satisfactory. Naturally, therefore, everyone felt more or less prejudiced against her. In July, greatly against our wishes, she accepted a very laborious and poorly-paid situation in England, which she exchanged, a few months later, for a much better post in Ireland. Yet, from the moment when she began to earn a little money, that poor girl has saved every possible penny of her scanty earnings, and has regularly sent her little savings to the Committee, for the support of her child.

Six or seven years ago, we befriended another girl after her second offence. She worked hard as a servant, and paid her contributions regularly for the maintenance of her child. A couple of years ago, she went wrong again. Then she came back, full of tears and repentance, to the ladies who had helped her before, and who had the charity to do so again. She now attends the Sacraments regularly, earns an honest and laborious living as a charwoman, and is devotedly attached to her unruly infant.

If we had adopted a cast-iron and arbitrary rule against helping relapsed cases, we should have refused assistance to these two girls, and our refusal would probably have

driven them, in desperation, to the streets, or to a Souper Home. Experience proves that there is a notable element of goodness in these weak and wayward creatures, who are usually more sinned against than sinning. In general, to speak of these unfortunate 'girls in trouble'—even of the relapsing ones—as if they were confirmed in evil, is to be guilty of uttering rather wild nonsense.

All this, however, is like the proverbial 'counting of one's chickens before they are hatched': it is legislating for Rescue Homes which have no existence in reality. Happily, if I mistake not, one Rescue Home, at least, will shortly be established in Ireland. I may say a few words about the project here.

Towards the end of August last, the chaplain and secretary of St. Pelagia's Home—the one an Irish Passionist, the other a devoted Irish layman—came on a holiday visit to Dublin. From them I learned that St. Pelagia's Home has been commended by the Ministry of Health as the most successful institution of its kind in the Kingdom. A tribute of this kind, paid by a Protestant Department to a purely Catholic institution, was assuredly no mean honour. I also learned that St. Pelagia's Home can manage to discover and reclaim only about ten per cent. of the Irish Catholic 'girls in trouble' who go over to hide their shame, somewhere or anywhere, in the South of England. It is estimated that the remaining ninety per cent. of these Irish Catholic 'girls in trouble' are lost in the underworld of London and other towns. I learned that Mother-General's main idea, in trying to secure some foundations in Ireland, was to arrest the evil at its source: to get hold of erring girls and reclaim them in Ireland, instead of allowing them to drift into the underworld of English cities and towns.

The secretary also informed me—and this was by far the most practical and important point—that he was empowered by Mother-General to make the following offer: To purchase a suitable house, with some acres of land attached, in Dublin, Cork, Limerick, or Waterford; and to convert the said house into a Rescue Home, without a

single penny of initial expense to the diocese. It was a munificent offer, and I hastened to lay it before the prelates concerned. The Bishop of Cork promptly closed with the proposal, and gave his hearty consent. In November, a magnificent site was secured, in circumstances of highly dramatic appropriateness, within easy reach of Cork. Thus the county which had the glory of giving birth to Mary Aikenhead and Nano Nagle, will have the honour of leading the van in the forward movement for the crushing of Souperism.

Another valuable Cross-Channel communication came from Mgr. Provost Brown, Vicar-General of Southwark, who has earned high distinction as an authority on educational and social work. Mgr. Brown's letter is of such interest and importance that, though it touches some delicate points, I quote it almost in full, as he kindly permits me to do so :—

I have read your article in the I. E. RECORD with much interest. The subject concerns me closely, as with others I have been trying to awaken interest in Rescue Work, through the National Board of Adult Rescue, to deal with unmarried mothers and, incidentally, their children. I also heard a good deal of evidence on various methods of Rescue, while serving on the National Committee on the Birth Rate. On all hands, it is a reproach against the Church that little is done for such unhappy women ; and we all find on the Board that it is extremely difficult to get good Catholics to interest themselves in the matter. They regard it as sinful and disgraceful, and do not want to come into contact with such people. Some Bishops and clergy are against the way of the sinner being made easy, as they would put it, and discourage our efforts. Yet the need is great, and the danger to Faith widespread.

Not all the non-Catholic Homes are out to proselytize. I have it from the head of a large organization that they have plenty of non-Catholic applicants, and only receive Catholics at their earnest request, because they cannot get admitted elsewhere. They would refer all Catholics to us if we could take them.

Nuns are not allowed to have midwifery homes. They may take cases *ante et post partum*, but the birth must take place elsewhere. Why, I cannot say. It seems strange that Nuns can nurse males, even as *private cases*, and yet not aid fellow-women at the time of birth. Most of the Refuges carried on by Nuns for fallen girls or unmarried mothers are of such a character as regards seclusion that many will not go to them at all. Besides, they cater for less educated and refined women on the whole. Homes, to be successful, must be graded for classes, and

the work most not be severe or unskilled manual labour, except in a few cases.

But these are matters of general policy. What interests me greatly is your courageous attack upon the expulsion from Ireland, or at least from the provinces, of girls who are to have a child, or even only fallen. It may be an excellent means of keeping down the figures of Irish illegitimacy, but it leads to great losses to the Church. Ireland should bear its own burden, and not 'fob off' the cases on to England and Scotland.

Leeds has two Rescue Homes, which do fine work. Last year I spoke for them; and at the time there was in one of them a girl of 14 with a child by [a relative of her own], sent from [a certain Irish diocese]. I daresay priests, hearing of such a case, would say it could not happen in Ireland.

The whole question needs ventilating; and the Catholic conscience needs to be awakened on the subject, just as on V.D. The horrible cases of innocent victims one comes across stagger one.¹

In reply to my suggestion that Nuns in charge of a Rescue Home might do what is commonly done by others—that is, they could send the patients to a Maternity Hospital when the proper time arrives, and take them back afterwards, Mgr. Brown wrote:—

As to Nuns not taking maternity cases, I fear the need is not met fully by sending them to Lying-in Hospitals or Workhouse Infirmaries. As to the first, the accommodation is limited; and besides, it means two transfers, with attendant trouble and expense. The second solution is avoided by many, because of the Poor Law taint and the kind of persons such patients have to consort with. More refined girls will not go, and so seek admission to Protestant Homes, graded according to class.

These letters, the fruit of Mgr. Brown's ripe experience, afford abundant food for reflection to all who take a practical interest in social work. In Dublin, at any rate, there ought to be little expense or trouble involved in transferring an expectant mother from a Rescue Home to one of the three great Maternity Hospitals, and she could easily return to the Rescue Home when discharged from the Hospital.

To me it seems clear as noonday that Rescue Homes, with their proper complement of Foundling Homes, are essential and indispensable to the success of rescue work

¹ See also his admirably outspoken and fearless paper in the current (Jan., 1922) issue of the *Dublin Review*.

in Ireland. Everyone who is accustomed to the daily or weekly routine of rescue cases, knows that these Rescue and Foundling Homes furnish the only key to a real solution of the problem. Without these Homes, we shall always be at the mercy of Soupers, and amateurs, and foster-mothers, and baby-farmers, and women who take a hand in rescue work for the sake of what they can make out of it. These Homes are imperatively needed, if we mean business. They are necessary, if we mean to abolish the national scandal of Souperism, to stop the leakage, to save countless souls of children and mothers from perversion and ruin, and to remove an unsightly blemish from the fair face of the Irish Church.

If Rescue Homes were properly set on foot, the harpies who now batten on rescue work and disgrace it would find their occupation gone. Since my former article appeared I was rejoiced to see that two of these harpies have been haled before the Dublin courts and heavily mulcted. There are others who deserve equally drastic treatment, but they are wily as foxes, and it is far from easy to prove a case against them.

One of the bye-products of my article was a letter from a Clogher priest, who had an illuminating experience to relate. A girl in his parish having 'got into trouble,' her mother appealed to the priest for advice and assistance. With a view of avoiding scandal and saving the girl's good name, the pastor answered an advertisement from a maternity home in a Dublin paper. The proprietress of the maternity home assured him that she was a good Catholic; she even gave a reference to the pastor of a parish not her own; and she professed to be keenly interested in rescue work. On the faith of these assurances, the girl was confided to her care. From the moment of her confinement, the girl was never once allowed a sight of her child. She was informed that the infant had been adopted by a good Catholic woman, who had no children of her own. Though the girl's mother, with rare generosity, had offered to rear the child, the infant was not to be had. Instead, the girl

was made to promise an adoption fee of £50, one-half of which was actually paid, in ready cash, into the hands of the proprietress of the home. Then the girl was made to sign a document, relinquishing all right and claim to the child. Needless to say, she was made to pay smartly for the time she had spent in the home, prior to her confinement, as well as for what the proprietress was pleased to describe as doctor's and chemist's bills. In the final result, the girl was kept in the home, in some menial capacity, on the plea that she was being trained for domestic service, though her mother was willing and eager to take her home.

That was the third case of the same kind that I had met with in six months, the proprietress of the same maternity home being the heroine of all three. The procedure in each case was perfectly simple and admirably ingenious. The mother was not allowed a sight of her child, and therefore could never recognize it afterwards. The same story was told in each case: the child had been adopted by an excellent Catholic, who was childless. A fee, to be paid to the proprietress of the home, was always required for the adoption. The alleged fees to doctor and chemist had always to be paid to the same proprietress. What became of the children—whether they were sold to the Soupers or handed over to baby-farmers, or given, with a small pittance, to poor women, who were found willing to adopt them—nobody knew, and nobody could discover. The woman had covered her tracks too cunningly.

Another reason for the establishment of Rescue and Foundling Homes arises from the unsatisfactory character of foster-mothers and adoptive mothers. If I had my way, I would never entrust an infant, under three or four years old, to one of these people. They are generally poor women, who seek to eke out their scanty resources by taking in a nurse-child. I strongly dissent from the dictum of Tennyson's Northern Farmer, that 'the poor in the loomp is bad,' and I gratefully admit that many of these poor women become sincerely fond of their nurse-children. But the system, on the whole, is very unsatisfactory.

Fosterage played a great part in Ireland in days gone by, but under conditions widely different from those of to-day. In ages past, as Dr. Joyce remarks, 'it was practised by persons of all classes, but more especially by those in the higher ranks'¹; and the foster-mothers had every inducement to bestow the utmost care and attention upon the children entrusted to their care by noble and influential families. Nowadays, the father of a nurse-child is very often a useless scamp of low degree; while the mother is some poor, struggling girl eager to hide her shame. As a class, and allowing for many worthy exceptions, the foster-mothers of to-day are often ignorant, often dirty, and often unscrupulous; very many of them live in slum tenements, which are centres of moral and physical infection. However careful a committee may be in the choice of foster-mothers, one never knows but that some of them may neglect the children, or commit some illegality, or create some scandal. A proper provision of Foundling Homes would save social workers from the everlasting worry attendant upon the employment of foster-mothers for very young children.

Whether Rescue and Foundling Homes should be placed under Nuns or under lay-matrons, is a legitimate subject of discussion. From every point of view—moral, religious, and financial—it seems to me that Nuns ought to be preferred. Nuns would have prestige, influence, and authority; they would command public confidence, such as lay-matrons could scarcely hope to gain. The influence of Nuns over the mothers and their children would be vastly more salutary than the influence of lay-matrons. Besides, the Nuns would probably give their services gratuitously; whereas a lay-matron, with two or three lay-assistants, would probably cost something like £600 a year. I am not forgetting the difficulties raised by Mgr. Brown in regard to the employment of Nuns in Rescue Homes; but I venture to think that, in many cases, those difficulties could be successfully overcome.

¹ *Social History of Ireland*, ii. 16.

Sir Joseph Glynn's article ¹ is a welcome contribution to the discussion. Experienced workers will cordially agree with much that he writes; but, if I am not greatly mistaken, they will regard his proposals with disfavour. For one thing, the cost of his scheme would be colossal. To set up a huge hostel and factory, capable of accommodating 400 or 500 girls with their 400 or 500 infants, under a competent staff of officials and experts, would be costly in the extreme. If only twenty children and their mothers are to be domiciled in each house, some twenty to twenty-five houses will be required; nearly one-half of Mountjoy Square will have to be secured for the purpose. A single house in that square would cost, roughly, about £1,000, taking the capital value of the head rents into consideration; hence twenty-five of them would cost about £25,000. The maintenance of 500 girls, at 30s. a week per head, would cost nearly £40,000 a year. The support of their 500 infants, at 30s. a month per head, would cost £9,000. A few thousands more would be swallowed up in salaries to the Lady Superintendent and her staff of maternity nurses and expert instructors, for we know that some 'trained social workers of good position' keep a sweetly calculating eye on pecuniary rewards. The additional cost of providing 'a well-lighted and ventilated building,' as a 'properly equipped factory' for 500 workers, may be left to the reader's imagination. The sight of 500 'girls in trouble,' trooping out of the mammoth hostel in Mountjoy Square, and marching to Mass in Gardiner Street on a Sunday morning, would be certain to create a fairly big sensation. The moral effect upon the girls themselves, of their being brought together in such vast numbers, would be simply deplorable. I would venture to suggest to Sir Joseph Glynn, who is so deservedly respected for his high character and well-intentioned zeal, that he has not carefully thought out the implications of his scheme.

Why can we not be content with modest beginnings?

¹ I. E. RECORD, Nov., 1921, Fifth Series, vol. xviii. p. 461.

Why not adopt a practical scheme, which has been tried with conspicuous success in London, Liverpool, Adelaide, and other cities? We have four Refuges for fallen women in Dublin. If we had an equal number of small Rescue Homes, each capable of accommodating fifty inmates, the four together could accommodate 200 inmates simultaneously. If 400 'girls in trouble' require to be sheltered and reformed in Dublin every year, they could easily find room in four Rescue Homes, such as I have been advocating; and each girl could stay six months in the Home—a generous margin of time, which comparatively few cases would require. I imagine that a small community of three or four Nuns would suffice for the management of each Home. The costs of establishment and maintenance could readily be met, as in Australia, by a diocesan collection; many of the girls could easily pay their own expenses in the Home, as well as contribute to the support of their children in Foundling Homes afterwards.

Meanwhile, there is not a single Rescue Home, in the proper sense of the term, for Catholic girls in Dublin or anywhere in Ireland, with the incipient exception of the Home which is being founded under such happy auspices in Cork. Neither is there a solitary Foundling Home, anywhere in Ireland, for the children of these hapless unmarried mothers. In Dublin and its vicinity alone, half-a-dozen Protestant institutions are open for the perversion of Catholic 'girls in trouble'; while thrice that number of Souper agencies are eager for the perversion of their children. In a characteristically tricky and disingenuous effort to confute my article, the Secretary of a Souper Home managed to send this barbed shaft straight to the bull's eye: 'It is with real satisfaction that I see an effort being made to stir up the conscience of Irish Roman Catholics to the needs and miseries of betrayed girls and their fatherless children.'

Another letter, purporting to come from a renegade Catholic, informs me that numbers of young men and girls attend a 'convert class' every week at a notorious Souper conventicle in Townsend Street; that four girls and three

men abjured the Catholic Faith on Sunday, September 25, 1921, in the said conventicle; and that, 'as far as I can see, your church and Teaching is a Fausle Relligion. It is a lot of Idolitary, Praying to Graven Imiages and Bowing down to them. The Roman Catholic Bible Sais you are not to pray to Imiages.' This may be taken as a sample of the teaching and culture of Souperism; and the epistle appropriately ends with 'God Save the King!'

The weekly 'convert class,' and the seven perverts of September 25, may be as unsubstantial as Falstaff's men in buckram or Mick M'Quaid's converts in the bogs of Connacht; for we know that 'wholesale, retail, systematic, and unscrupulous lying,' to borrow Newman's famous phrase, forms the warp and woof of Souperism. Still, there may be some grains of truth in the story; for the Souper mercenaries cannot go on, from year to year, without producing some results to justify their existence and to satisfy their paymasters. In any case, this epistle may serve to remind us that Souperism is a hydra with many heads, of which the principal is the traffic—as degrading and denationalizing a traffic as ever was—in unmarried mothers and their helpless children.

M. H. MACINERNY, O.P.

IS TEMPTATION EVER IRRESISTIBLE ?

BY REV. DAVID BARRY

THE late Dr. MacDonald, in his work on *The Principles of Moral Science*,¹ contemplates the existence of 'extraordinary cases when the temptation is so strong as to be irresistible,' and when, consequently, there is no sin. Moreover, Canon 2206 of the Code, based on previous legislation, implies the same possibility : 'Passion, if it is deliberately excited or cherished, rather increases imputability ; otherwise it more or less diminishes it according to the strength of its onset ; and it does away with it altogether, if it entirely precedes and precludes mental deliberation and the consent of the will.' But, on the other hand, this teaching has to be reconciled with the infallibility of prayer, and the general persuasion of our culpability if we yield to temptation. And great authorities, of whom Lehmkuhl² may be taken as an example, seem implicitly to deny the possibility that a person with the normal use of his faculties may have his reason completely obscured and his will power overmastered by temptation, unless there be some default on his part, such as neglect of prayer or other necessary means of resistance. Indeed, many texts of Scripture may be quoted that seem conclusive in this sense : 'But the lust thereof shall be under thee, and thou shalt have dominion over it' (Gen. iv. 7) ; 'And thou has girded me with strength unto battle ; and hast subdued under me them that rose up against me' (Ps. xvii. 40). Equally definite is the text of the Council of Trent : 'God does not command what is impossible, but by commanding warns us to do what we are able, and to seek help in so

¹ p. 183 (1st ed.).

² *Theologia Moralis*, i. n. 92 (11th ed.).

far as we are not able; and He helps us in order that we may be able.¹

Now the question arises as to how the two positions are to be harmonized. For there is at least a superficial contradiction between the view that passion, *to which temptation always owes most of its appeal*, can reduce a person to a state of complete irresponsibility, and that its domination may be broken by the ever ready weapon of prayer vested with the proper conditions. Well, it may in the first place be helpful, with a view to narrowing divergences, to explore the ground that is common to both sides, and outside of which no Catholic can take his stand without peril to his faith.

It is to be noted, then, as certain, that it is only rarely that passion or concupiscence is so strong as to impede the exercise of free will altogether, and comparatively seldom, too, that it so restricts this as to reduce what would otherwise be a mortal sin to the dimensions of a venial one. In the second place, it is Catholic doctrine that, though we have with the *ordinary* concurrence of God sufficient strength of will to overcome temptations of a slight degree of seductiveness, we are sure in the course of life² to encounter those that, without the *special* help of God, we should be unable³ to overcome, and for yielding to which we should nevertheless be responsible. In fact, the majority of theologians hold that without this extraordinary aid one would not be able to surmount any serious temptation at all, especially if it were formidable by reason of its duration.⁴ But others temper this to the extent of holding that it is only sometimes a temptation presents itself that is insuperable by the human will, fortified and acting in

¹ Sess. VI. cap. xi.

² As St. Bonaventure puts it: 'Liberum arbitrium omni gratia destitutum nec potest omni tentationi resistere, nec necesse habet omni tentationi succumbere.'

³ According to the common opinion this impossibility is moral, not physical.

⁴ Jungmann, *de Gratia*, n. 135; Perrone, *de Gratia*, pars i. cap. 2, prop. 2; Pohle in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vi. p. 700.

co-operation with the Divine assistance that is connatural to it.¹ The special help being required merely to make up for our native insufficiency need not necessarily be supernatural in the strictest sense of the term. Though, as a fact, many authors, following the lead of Ripalda, hold that God always does give such, at least in the case of Christians, thereby enabling us not only to escape sin, but to merit heaven.²

It is the settled teaching, too, that usually the grace in question will not be granted without our praying for it. Thus St. Alphonsus says: '*Whoever finds himself assailed by any grievous temptation without doubt sins mortally if he does not have recourse to God in prayer, to ask for assistance to resist it.*'³ Supposing, however, that a person does his part by praying and by trying to avoid temptation, is it possible none the less that this may so influence him through its alluring nature, especially if seconded by a weakness or bias that he has inherited or acquired, that he may commit a material sin, and yet be not answerable for it? A combination of circumstances that, as is evident, is much more likely to occur in the case of internal than of external offences.

Well, to enable the reader to decide for himself, I cannot do better than refer to or quote with little comment, a few texts of Scripture, certain official pronouncements of the Church, and the view of some representative theologians. Now, all the passages of Scripture that witness to the efficacy of prayer indirectly vouch for the possibility of always contending successfully for victory when we are tempted. For in no circumstances can we ask any spiritual favour—not to speak of a temporal one—more acceptable to God than a meritorious and strictly supernatural triumph over temptation. And there are, no doubt, few things of greater value and importance in His sight than a mere

¹ Pesch, *de Gratia*, nn. 156 sqq.

² Jungmann, *op. cit.*, n. 155.

³ *Prayer*, edited by Coyle, iii. p. 90. Cf. the Saint's *Theologia Moralis*, lib. iii., at the beginning.

escape in the natural order from a material sin. So that the overcoming, though not the total avoidance,¹ of temptation may be said to be, in a special and peculiar way, the appropriate end and object of prayer.

As for passages of Scripture *directly* dealing with the pressure of temptation, and the means of freeing oneself from it, some of the most famous are found in the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans (vv. 15 sqq.): 'For I do not that good which I will; but the evil which I hate that I do. . . . Now then it is no more I that do it but sin that dwelleth in me. . . . For the good which I will I do not; but the evil which I will not that I do. . . . But I see another law in my members, fighting against the law of my mind, and captivating me in the law of sin, that is, in my members.' So far St. Paul would seem to be unmistakably on the side of those who recognize the occasional impossibility of resisting temptation. Because he envisages circumstances where, apparently, the will is reduced to such a state of subserviency, and passion has reached such a degree of influence, as to allow little or no scope to freedom. But this impression is dissipated by the next verses (vii. 24, 25), where he asks: 'Unhappy man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?' And answers: 'The grace of God, by Jesus Christ our Lord.'

And that our natural weakness is compensated for, he makes clear also a little later (viii. 3): 'For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and of sin' [made possible]. To the same reassuring effect are his words to the Corinthians (1 Cor. x. 13): 'And God is faithful who will not suffer you to be tempted above that which you are able: but will make also with temptation issue that you may be able to bear it.' From which Jungmann draws the conclusion that 'non est, cur etiam in gravissima tentatione desperetis.'²

As an example of authoritative pronouncements of the

¹ St. Alphonsus, *Prayer*, iii. p. 55.

² Op. cit., n. 135.

Church, in addition to the canon of the Code and the words of the Council of Trent given above, I need only refer to the first proposition of Jansen¹: 'Some Divine precepts are to the just, willing and endeavouring to keep them, impossible with the strength they have : the grace of God by which they may become possible is also wanting to them.' I do not think, however, that the teaching constructively conveyed by the condemnation of this view makes the position of those untenable who allow for the complete enfeeblement or paralysis of the will, now and then. Because the proposition, besides being derogatory to the Divine goodness, embodies too low an appreciation of human nature to allow it to be entertained for a moment by any orthodox theologian.²

Coming to the Doctors and Theologians, St. Augustine's view may be said to be sufficiently clear, from the fact that the words of Trent I quoted at the beginning are a celebrated text of his that was adopted by the Council. However, it must not be forgotten that he also says : 'Dum consuetudini non resistitur facta est necessitas.' And St. John Chrysostom thus characterizes this same powerful auxiliary or channel of temptation : 'Dura est consuetudo quae nonnunquam nolentes committere cogit illicita.'

St. Thomas alludes to the question at issue in many parts of the *Summa Theologica*³ in connexion with the influence of concupiscence or passion, which in the state of fallen nature is, as I have said already, the great vehicle of temptation. His views are quite consistent in all these places ; though in some they are elaborated at greater length than in others. I will give two extracts as fairly typical and sufficient to convey an accurate impression of the Saint's teaching on the question : 'If concupiscence completely precludes knowledge, as happens in the case of

¹ Denzinger, n. 1092 (11th ed.).

² Cf. Council of Trent, Sess. V. can. 18.

³ *Prima Secundae*, q. 6, art. 7 ad 3 ; q. 10, art. 3 ; q. 77, art. 6 and 7. *Secunda Secundae*, q. 150, art. 4 ad 3 ; q. 156, art. 4 ad 2 ; q. 157, art. 3 ad 3 ; q. 175, art. 2 ad 2, etc.

those who on account of it become insane (*amentes*), it would follow that concupiscence would do away with voluntariety.¹ Again he says the force of passion can act in two ways:—

One way so that reason is altogether hampered and the person cannot exercise it at all, as occurs in the case of those who on account of violent anger or concupiscence become mad (*furiosi*) or insane, and as would happen through any other disturbance of the body's functions; for these passions do not operate without causing a change in the body. Such persons are no more accountable than brute beasts which necessarily yield to the pressure of passion. But *sometimes* reason² is not entirely engulfed in the flood of passion, but remains free to pass judgment: and in so far the will has power to act as the reason is unhampered in judging.³

Now, I venture to think that St. Thomas's decision depends on whether he assumes that the two classes he specifies as being subject to a passion—those in love and those in anger—have been actually driven insane by it for a longer or shorter interval, or whether, on the other hand, he has in view those whom we would speak of as being in a state of excitement or temper that is transient in its effects, and who could not be classed as mentally defective. If he is speaking of those insane in the strict sense of the word, it must be assumed that he implies in these passages and others that no one else is subjected to an uncontrollable onset of emotion. But, of course, if he has in mind those whom a gust of passion, however it may affect them for the time being,⁴ leaves quite normal, he must be taken as holding that various passions—those he instances are usually the severest as well as the most familiar to us—may so upset a person's mental equilibrium, that he is not accountable for his acts while under the strain of them.

That St. Thomas's category of the insane was much more comprehensive than ours, and that he, now and then

¹ 1a, 2ae, q. 6, art. 7 ad 3.

² The Schoolmen, at times, consider that the will is an integral part of 'reason'; but it is clear that St. Thomas does not do so, here at least.

³ 1a, 2ae, q. 10, art. 3, corp.

⁴ This is the interpretation of the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, xiv. p. 7, where the agent is spoken of as 'being for the moment beside himself.'

at any rate, attached the epithet to those to whom we should not think of applying it, cannot be denied. For in one place, after having spoken of bodily weakness (*insania*) he characterises mental insanity as that which draws a person away from his proper relationship to the human species. This, he says, happens, both when a man's reason is affected by his suffering the loss of it, and when his reason is affected by his losing his natural affection for his fellows. And he gives as an instance of the latter the case of a person rejoicing when his neighbour is punished. 'Quod aliquis delectetur in poenis hominum dicitur esse insania; quia per hoc videtur homo privatus affectu humano.'¹

As for St. Alphonsus, he is very clear that no one possessing average mental vigour can be so worked upon by any passion, as not to be in a position to pray for and get such grace as will enable him overcome it: 'Chastity is a virtue which we have not strength to practise, unless God gives it to us; and God does not give this strength except to him who asks for it. But whoever prays for it will certainly obtain it.'² And again he says: 'Wrongly, therefore, do these sinners excuse themselves who say that they have no strength to resist temptation. But if you have not this strength why do you not ask for it? is the reproach which St. James gives them: *You have not because you ask not.*'³ And again: 'When we find ourselves weak and unable to overcome any passion or any great difficulty, so as to fulfil that which God requires of us, let us take courage and say with the Apostle, *I can do all things in Him who strengtheneth me.* With our own strength certainly we can do nothing; but with God's help we can do everything.'⁴

However, if we turn to see what can be said for the opposite opinion, we find that St. Alphonsus may be counted among the supporters of it also. For in his *Moral Theology*, in the treatise on sins, he quotes Busenbaum without

¹ 2a, 2ae, q. 157, art. 3 ad 3.

² *Prayer*, i. p. 12.

³ *Ibid.* p. 12.

⁴ *Ibid.* iii. p. 75.

comment, as follows: 'Very violent emotions of anger or concupiscence, by which the use of reason is disturbed and liberty destroyed, are excused from sin.'¹ Of course, the Saint, nor indeed anyone who seeks to excuse the yielding to temptation in circumstances of extraordinary difficulty, is not abstracting from the presence of grace. For, as we saw, the majority of theologians hold that any serious temptation at all cannot be resisted without its assistance; nor is there any excuse for one that could, and would not, avoid material sin by performing the easy duty of prayer. So that the authorities are plainly considering the concrete case of one who, in his extremity, does his best to obtain the Divine help.

In his treatise on Human Acts, in dealing with the subject of antecedent or involuntary concupiscence, St. Alphonsus holds that this kind of passion lessens voluntariety, and sometimes takes it away altogether, through *obstructing or blocking the avenues of knowledge*.² So that he does not seem to allow that responsibility may be in abeyance, or diminished at all, by reason of the *direct* pressure of passion on the will, provided the intellect remains alive to the malice of the temptation. In this he is closely following St. Thomas, as appears from the two passages I have given from the *Summa*. Hickey, in his *Psychology*,³ adopts the same principle: '*Imperio politico voluntatis liberae appetitus tum concupiscibilis tum irascibilis vere subest. Sufficienti enim rationis usu supposito, actibus utriusque, non solum consensum negare sed etiam utrumque libere oppugnare possumus.*'⁴ As is evident, passion or temptation may have a very injurious effect on the will without trespassing at all on the domain of knowledge.⁵ And those who seem to attribute its exonerating effect solely to its interference with the latter, are less likely to entertain a plea of extenuating circumstances for those

¹ Lib. v. n. 2, 2°.

² Lib. v. xxv.

³ n. 318 (1st ed.).

⁴ Cf. Walsh, *de Actibus Humanis*, n. 296.

⁵ Billuart, *de Actibus Humanis*, diss. i. art. 8 (towards the end).

sorely tempted, than one would who has an open mind as to its baneful action on the will directly.

I have already referred to Lehmkuhl as apparently very definite that a person is answerable for succumbing to temptation in any circumstances. But he, too, like St. Alphonsus, is not quite uncompromising, and may be quoted in the opposite sense. For instance, speaking of concupiscence, in so far as it has not been deliberately induced or embraced, he says¹ that neither itself nor the effects² of it can be sinful. And again,³ he lays it down that the attack of concupiscence may be so overwhelming as in a manner to take will power away with it captive. Moreover, he adds elsewhere,⁴ that this happens not infrequently, especially if the devil is the source of the temptation.⁵

According to Dr. Walsh, concupiscence or temptation, unless it reaches a pitch of the greatest intensity,⁶ which is a matter of very rare occurrence, scarcely ever brings it about that a sin otherwise mortal would be merely venial—let alone its excluding malice entirely. In fact, I have seen no author who ascribes so little to passion, in the way of creating discordance between responsibility and objective morality, as the late Archbishop.

Father Maher, in his *Psychology*, says that ‘a thought or feeling from which we desire to escape’ may have, in certain circumstances, an ‘overpowering intensity, as many a poor, misguided, but well-intentioned sufferer has found to his cost.’⁷ And in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* he calls attention to the fact that ‘The faculty of inhibiting pressing desires, of concentrating attention on more remote goods, of reinforcing the higher but less urgent motives, undergoes a kind of atrophy by disuse. In proportion as a man

¹ Op. cit., n. 81.

² According to his *Casus*, n. 30, these are not *perfectly* voluntary.

³ *Theologia Moralis*, i. n. 80.

⁴ *Casus*, n. 30, R. 1; cf. n. 135.

⁵ *Th. Mor.*, ii. n. 629.

⁶ Op. cit., n. 302, 1.

⁷ p. 387 (5th ed.).

habitually yields to intemperance or some other vice, his freedom diminishes and he does, in a true sense, sink into slavery. He continues responsible *in causa* for his subsequent conduct, though his ability to resist temptation at the time is lessened.’¹ Again, in the same work, in conjunction with another writer, Father Maher states that ‘Emotions or feelings . . . may dominate the field of consciousness to the exclusion of every other idea . . . such action is impulsive. And impulse is essentially the forcible promptings of a single strongly effective idea. The will is, in this case, as it were, borne down by feeling, and action is simply the ‘release’ of an emotional strain, being scarcely more truly volitional than laughter or weeping.’²

Another article in the *Encyclopedia*, referring to the passions, says: ‘Their motions may sometimes be antecedent to any act of the will; or they may be so strong as to resist every command of the will, as, for example, the feelings of love, sorrow, fear, and anger, as experienced in the sensitive appetite; but they can never be so strong as to force the consent of our free will unless they first run away with our reason.’³ As a last indication of the views of the *Encyclopedia* on the question at issue, I will quote Dr. Pohle: ‘God may either await the moment of its actual necessity before bestowing grace, or He may, even in time of need (e.g., in vehement temptation), grant immediately only the grace of prayer (*gratia orationis sive remote sufficiens*). But in the latter case He must be ever ready to confer immediate grace for action (*gratia operationis sive proxime sufficiens*), if the adult has made a faithful use of the grace of prayer.’⁴

According to Billuart, a very reliable commentator on St. Thomas, involuntary *concupiscence* lessens the malice of a sin that is the outcome of it, and sometimes, if it is severe enough, exonerates a person altogether.⁵ But he apparently

¹ Vol. vi. p. 263.

⁴ Vol. vi. p. 700.

² Vol. xv. p. 625.

⁵ *De Actibus Humanis*, diss. i. art. 8.

³ Vol. xi. p. 534.

considers that this latter only takes place when the passion is so aggravated as to make the person subject to it insane. Though he adds that the confessor must be careful to observe that if a sinner detests a bad *habit*, and adopts the means to eradicate it so far as he can, then evil actions of which it is the source, e.g., using blasphemous expressions, are no longer culpable because he is not free in originating them.¹ Advice based on the same principle is given us by Noldin and Tanqueray.²

Father Slater's views on the subject do not appear to be quite consistent. His opinion is clear enough where he states that 'It sometimes happens that antecedent concupiscence renders the subsequent action involuntary, and so in no wise imputable, however wrong it may be. This will be the case when some sudden onslaught of passion deprives the agent of the use of reason and blindly impels him to evil. Strong passions, such as love or anger, especially in impressionable natures, sometimes produce this result, and even when murder or suicide is committed in such circumstances juries are warranted in bringing a merciful verdict of murder or suicide while temporarily insane.'³ But in a footnote to this, *apropos* of those who have 'natural propensities to evil, arising from hereditary taint or from temperament,' he says: 'As long as they are in their right senses,' with the help of God's grace *they can resist*. And then he adds what seems to be irreconcilable with the extract I have given above: 'The same must be said of those who have strengthened their passions and weakened their wills by long indulgence in a habit of sin.'

With a view to a just appreciation of the position of those who maintain that the will can be constrained by a temptation of exceptional violence, we should remember, in the first place, that there is question, of course, of the commission not of formal but of material sin—which is not a true moral evil at all. And secondly, that God does not hinder such, e.g., if it be due to invincible ignorance;

¹ *De Actibus Humanis*, at end.

² *Theologia Moralis*, i. n. 103.

³ *Moral Theology*, p. 35.

and that He does not always prevent certain bodily effects that happen quite inculpably, and that, if they were covered by free consent, would be grievous sins.¹

I may conclude by remarking how dangerous it is, and how reluctant we should be, to assume that any temptation is irresistible. In fact, we ought to urge our penitents always, and especially when the temptation is at its most alluring stage, to continue to pray; and also to use natural aids to extricate themselves from it, for which there is more scope if it be due to an occasion than if it be purely internal. 'And when we find ourselves in danger of offending God, or in any other critical position, and are too confused to know what is best to be done, let us recommend ourselves to God, saying, *The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear?* And let us be sure God will then certainly give us light, and will save us from every evil.'²

DAVID BARRY.

¹ Lehmkuhl, *Theologia Moralis*, i. n. 1041. Cf. authors *passim*.

² St. Alphonsus, *Prayer*, iii. p. 76.

STUDIES IN IRISH MONETARY HISTORY

BY DOM P. NOLAN, O.S.B., M.A.

V

BARTER

WE have, as a matter of convenience, alluded at the outset to the question of the existence of an early native Irish coinage, although in so doing we have anticipated somewhat, as we may take it for granted that in the primitive stages of society in Ireland, as elsewhere, money was unknown and exchanges were made by a system of barter. The word barter is taken by lexicographers and used in common language to mean any exchange of goods for goods without the intervention of money. But this definition of the word seems to us to be incomplete and unscientific, and does not distinguish between two very different forms and stages of barter.

There is, first of all, the most primitive form, which consists of a haphazard truck or exchange of goods which are supposed roughly to be of equivalent value, without any reference to a common standard or measure of value. Thus, to give an example from Homer, we read as follows in the *Iliad* (vii. 467 ss.):—

From Lemnos' isle a num'rous fleet had come
Freighted with wine. . . .
A thousand measures; all the other Greeks
Hastened to purchase, some with brass, and some
With gleaming iron; other some with hides,
Cattle or slaves.

Here, apparently, we have barter pure and simple, and of the most elementary and primitive kind. A ship appears off the Trojan coast, bearing wine sent specially as a gift

to the two sons of Atreus, but the other Greeks hasten to offer anything at their command in exchange for the coveted liquor, much in the same way as the rag and bone man offers all sorts of 'unconsidered trifles' in exchange for the thing he wants, or as the European trader exchanges worthless trinkets for the valuable wares of unsophisticated savages.

But these primitive conditions cannot last for any length of time. After repeated transactions the different goods acquire a definite value with respect to each other or to a third commodity, and as soon as a common standard is set up primitive barter, pure and simple, ceases. Thus of the wares mentioned in the passage from Homer there is not one which has not become at one time or another a species of currency or standard of value and exchange, and this is true, especially, of cattle. Moreover, Homer seems to mention this, even to him, primitive method of trafficking as something unusual and specially worthy of record.

We may remark that in this transaction one particular commodity is exchanged against a variety of goods, so that if we are to use the word purchase at all it would be more correct to say that these goods were purchased by wine¹ than *vice versa*. The wine would soon acquire a definite value in exchange for the other commodities, and if such transactions were frequent it would become a recognized standard of value and medium of exchange.

This interesting passage of Homer has not escaped the attention of the Roman jurists. It has been referred to by Gaius, and after him by the compilers of the Institutes, in elucidation of the question as to whether there can be any real 'purchase and sale' without the intervention of money. The passage is worth translating, as many economic ideas are to be gleaned from the pages of the jurists,

¹ We have given Lord Derby's version, but it is not quite accurate. Homer does not say the Greeks *purchased* wine, but uses the word *οἰνίφοιτο*, i.e., *wined*, or procured wine by exchange, some by giving the skins of cattle, others by giving the whole beasts.

and this particular passage sheds some light on the real nature of barter and sale :—

Likewise *price* must be made of money reckoned out.¹ For it was much disputed whether a price could be made up of other things, whether, e.g., a man, or an estate, or a toga could be the price of another thing. Sabinus and Cassius are of opinion that a price may be composed even of other things [besides money] hence the former common opinion that by an exchange of things (*per permutationem rerum*) a contract of purchase and sale is effected and that this sort of purchase and sale is very ancient (*vetustissimam*—? ‘the oldest of all’); and they used as their authority the Greek poet, Homer, who says somewhere, in the following words, that the army of the Greeks provided themselves with wine by the exchange of certain things. [Here follow the verses of Homer which we have quoted above.] [But] the authors of a different school thought the contrary, and were of opinion that an exchange of things is one thing and their purchase and sale another thing. Otherwise it would not be clear, in an exchange of things, what thing appears to be sold and what is given in the guise of a price : for it is not consonant with reason that both things should appear to have been sold and to have been given as a price. But the opinion of Proculus, who says that exchange is a special form of contract and different from sale, has rightly held the field, seeing that he himself is supported by other Homeric verses² and proves his case by more weighty reasons. And this [view] has been admitted by former divine emperors and is set forth at greater length in our Digests.³

We might, however, quote against the learned Roman jurists the following interesting and instructive Latin entry made some 1000 years ago in the Irish MS., known as the Gospels of St. Chad, preserved in Lichfield Cathedral :—

Ostenditur hic quod emit gelhi filius Arihtuid hoc evangelium de Cingal et dedit illi p[ro] illo equum optimum et dedit p[ro] anima sua istum evangelium deo et sc. Teliano super altare + gelhi + filius Arihtuid, etc.

Here it is shewn that Gelhi, son of Arihtuid, *bought* this gospel from Cingal and gave him for it his best horse (or a first-class horse) and gave for his soul's sake this gospel to God and St. Teilo⁴ and put it on the altar, etc.

¹ Or ‘paid out’ : ‘Pretium in numerata pecunia consistere debet.’

² e.g., *Iliad*, VI. 236, which we cite and comment on elsewhere.

³ Institutes of Justinian, Bk. iii. tit. 23, *De Emptione et Venditione*. Throughout the greater part of this passage the compilers have used the very words of Gaius, the second-century Roman jurist, and woven them into their text. Vide also Digests, xviii. 1, and xix. 4.

⁴ Patron of Llandaff, in Wales. This shows that the volume was formerly in Wales, with which Ireland was in early times very closely connected.

This transaction would be regarded by the Roman jurists simply as an exchange, but Gelhi seems to have regarded himself as the purchaser, as he was apparently anxious to procure the Gospels, and offered as a price a horse of value; and so the party who parted with the book of the Gospels may be said to have sold it for the horse rather than to have purchased a horse with the book. The book was probably unique, while horses were, no doubt, plentiful, and may have been a common medium of exchange, and whenever any particular commodity, such as cattle, becomes a generally recognized standard and medium of exchange, primitive barter, pure and simple, no longer exists, even though the goods are not exchanged for money.

Now let us turn to Ireland. We have seen that Tigernmas, the twenty-sixth Milesian king, who is said to have flourished about the year 935 B.C., is traditionally held to have been the first to have smelted gold in Ireland. His reign carries our thoughts back to the dim and misty past, to a period contemporary with or perhaps anterior to that of Homer¹ and to a state of civilization similar in many respects to that depicted in the Homeric poems, a state of which we have tried to give some account in the preceding chapter.

Ancient Ireland, like modern Ireland, and indeed like most countries in their early stages, was mainly a pastoral and agricultural country. Manufactures on a large scale did not and could not exist. The principal and the best known form of material wealth was agricultural produce—corn, cattle, etc.—and this would very naturally become a standard of value and medium of exchange. But exchanges were much less frequent and much less necessary than in our days, for we must remember that Irish civilization was built upon the patriarchal and tribal system, which was, to a certain extent, socialistic and communistic in its nature. The chief of the clan or of the tribe and his

¹ Herodotus (born c. 484 B.C.) assigns Homer to a period 400 years before his own, or say, roughly, 850 B.C.

tribesmen held things to a certain degree in common. The head provided for the members what was necessary in peace and war, or gave them the means of providing for themselves. Their wives and daughters would spin and weave and provide for household needs.

In such a State extraordinary needs could be provided for by barter, pure and simple, that is, by the direct exchange of one commodity for another. But such a simple State could never last long, and indeed the State I have described is more or less a fanciful one,¹ for, as a matter of fact, the earliest state of Irish society, as depicted for us in the ancient legends, poems, histories, and law-tracts, is already a much more highly-developed and complex one. Specialization must always speedily set in, and with it the need for exchange on a more elaborate scale. This or that tribesman or tribeswoman, for example, would develop a particular facility for spinning or weaving, while other households, for one reason or another, would have no one to exercise these arts for them, and they would be obliged to apply to the specialists for their needs, offering in exchange whatever suitable wares they could afford to part with. Or again, one man is a powerful and skilful iron-worker, and can turn out spears and battle-axes better than and more quickly than others; another has a special, probably a hereditary, talent for the law, and becomes a Brehon, like his father and grandfather before him, and so on. These specialists have their own particular needs and cannot accept from their clients all sorts of nondescript things, which the latter may offer them. They will require first of all the necessities of life—food and clothing—but only to a limited extent, for their own use; the surplus they will exchange. If they accept anything beyond what they actually want for present or future personal needs, it will be either necessities, which have always a recognized value and are always readily accepted in exchange by others

¹ We may cite here the saying of Niebuhr that 'all absolute beginning lies out of the reach of our mental conceptions, which comprehend nothing beyond development and progress' (*Römische Geschichte*, 2nd ed., vol. i. p. 55).

of the community; or luxuries—jewels, precious metals, works of art, and other valuables, for which the individual himself has a natural desire, a desire which he knows to be shared by his fellow-men. In the first category fall corn, cattle, and food-stuffs, which are always in demand, and to these we must add, for pagan or semi-Christian countries, human beings, i.e., slaves, which, even in Ireland, were a medium and object of traffic. These, then, especially cattle, will become a common medium of exchange and acquire a recognized value. Thus we have passed beyond a system of barter, strictly so-called, although most writers, erroneously, as we have already suggested, call all exchange of commodities barter, whereas, as soon as any one commodity is fixed on as a measure of value and medium of exchange, it thereby really becomes, *ipso facto*, a sort of money.

Such is an *a priori* presentment of things as we may suppose them to have existed; let us now turn to historical facts.

We learn from Keating,¹ whose work is based on the most ancient records, that Tuathal Teachtmair, who is said to have become king in the year of Our Lord 95, built the fortress of Uisneach 'where a general meeting of the men of Ireland used to be held, which was called the convention of Uisneach, and it was at Bealltaine [i.e., May-day] that this fair took place, at which it was their custom to *exchange* with one another their goods, their wares, and their valuables. . . . The horse and the trappings of every chieftain who came to the great meeting of Uisneach were to be given as a tax to the King of Connaught.'

Here we have simple exchange or barter, and there is no mention or hint of the use of money; but we cannot help supposing that the chieftains who had to part with their horses and trappings must have been allowed to commute the tax and redeem it in kind or some sort of money. It is interesting to note that there still exists an Irish word,² *bealltaine*, meaning 'a compact, agreement,' which probably had its origin in this fair.

¹ *Hist. of Ireland*, I.T.S., Bk. i. s. 39.

² O'Reilly, *Ir. Dict.*, s.v.

The payment of wages and tribute and taxes in kind is frequently mentioned. The king, Seadna Ionnnaird (Seadna Ionnnaraidh; ? 928-909 B.C.), 'Seadna of the Wages,' was so called because he was 'the first king who gave pay to fighting men in Ireland.'¹ Now, the Fian, or national militia, used to be quartered or billeted upon the men of Ireland from Samhain to Bealltaine, i.e., from about All Hallows till May-day, in other words, during the winter and spring, during which period it seems they were requited for their services to the king and nation by being supported by the people. But from Bealltaine to Samhain, i.e., in the spring, summer, and autumn, they were 'to be engaged in hunting, and the chase, and in every other duty the King of Ireland might impose upon them. . . . For this they had a certain pay, as every king in Europe gives pay to the captains . . . who serve under him.' But during this, the hunting season, they 'were obliged to depend solely on the products . . . of the chase as maintenance and wages from the kings of Ireland; thus they were to have the flesh for food and the skins of the wild animals for pay.'² Here we have no mention of money, but wages paid in kind, and, no doubt, the Fianna bartered the surplus carcasses and skins for whatever else they needed. The pay of the Fianna was not 'wages' in the strict sense of the term. In the winter, when they could not earn a living for themselves by the chase they were billeted on the people, who provided them with board and lodging. In the hunting season they seem to have had ample sporting privileges, and provided themselves with their wants. But their gains are termed 'wages,' because, being a national institution and extra-tribal, they were

¹ Keating, Bk. i. s. 26. But MacGeoghegan (the translator of the *Annals of Clonmacnoise*) and Lynch say that wages began to be paid to people generally in his reign. 'This Sedna was a worthy noble king, and the first that rewarded men with chattle in Ireland' (*Ann. of Clonmac.*). A.M. 4271 [? 928 B.C.]: 'The first year of the reign of Sedna Innaraign, son of Breas, son of Art Imleach, in the sovereignty of Ireland'; A.M. 4290 [? 909 B.C.]: 'Sedna Innarraigh, having been 20 years in the sovereignty of Ireland, fell by Simon Breac' (*Four Masters*).

² *Ibid.* i. 45.

supported to some extent at the expense of the nation instead of looking for their support to the head of their particular tribes.

Let us now consider an example of the payment of tribute and taxes in kind, which seems to have been a universal practice :—

Feidlimid ¹ made the circuit of Leath Cuinn and paid the rents that by law its kings were entitled to from the kings of Cashel—while they gave the food-supply that they were bound to give in exchange for them—and the wages that the kings of Cashel were bound to pay to the kings of Leath Cuinn and to the kings of Leinster, and to the chief territorial lords that were under them, as St. Benen, . . . primate of Ireland, sets it down in the Book of Rights in the poem which begins : ‘ Every king is entitled to get from the king of Cashel.’ Now the following are the rent and wages of these kings from the king of Cashel, and his circuit amongst them and his seasons for getting provisions from them on the occasion of it : 100 swords, 100 goblets, 100 steeds, and 100 mantles for the king of Cruachain, ² and provision for two quarters [of a year] from the king of Cruachain to the king of Cashel, and that he should escort him to Tir Chonaill ³ ; 20 bracelets or rings [fáil nó fáinne], 20 chess-boards, 20 steeds for the king of Cineal Conaill, and provision for a month from the king of Cineal Conaill, and that he should escort him to Tir Eoghain ⁴ ; 50 goblets, 50 swords for the king of Oileach, ⁵ and provision for a month, and that he should escort him to Tulach Og ⁶ ; 30 goblets, 30 swords for the prince of Tulach Og, ⁷ provision for twelve days from him for the king of Munster, and that he should escort him to Oirghialla ⁸ ; eight coats of mail, three score tunics and three score steeds for the king of Oirghialla, and provision for him [i.e., the king of Cashel] for a month in Eamhain, and that he should escort him to Ulster ⁹ to the clan Rudhruighe ; 100 goblets, 100 mantles, 100 swords, 100 steeds and 10 ships for the king of Ulster and provision for two months from the clan Rudhruighe for him, and that he should escort him to Tara ; 30 coats of mail, 30 rings, 100 steeds, and 30 chess-boards for the king of Tara, and provision for a month from the king of Tara for him and

¹ ‘ King of Munster and Archbishop of Leath Mogha ’ (Keating, ii. 17).

² i.e., King of Connacht

³ i.e., O'Donnell country.

⁴ i.e., O'Neill's territory.

⁵ i.e., O'Neill.

⁶ Where the O'Neills had their inauguration seat.

⁷ i.e., O'Hagan.

⁸ Oriel.

⁹ i.e., Ulidia, the small corner of Ulster which was left to the Clan Rory, whose capital was Emania. The Collas (Oriel) had filched the greater part of Ulster from the Clan Rory, and the O'Neills took a large slice from both these clans to enlarge Tyrone.

the four tribes of Tara to escort him to Ath Cliath (Dublin); 10 women, 10 ships, 10 steeds, for the king of Ath Cliath and provision for a month for him from the king of Ath Cliath, and that he should escort him to Leinster; 30 cows, 30 ships, 30 steeds, 30 female slaves [cumat] or maidens for the king of Leinster, and provision for two months for him from Leinster, to wit, a month from Upper Leinster and a month from Lower Leinster; 30 steeds, 30 coats of mail, 30 swords for the chief of Lower Leinster from the king of Cashel.¹

Here again we have tribute and mutual debts and obligations paid without the intervention of money. The King-Archbishop of Cashel makes a tour in Conn's half, i.e., the northern half of Ireland, in order to pay the rents and wages due to the princes thereof, in return for which he gets provisions and 'food-supply that they were bound to give in exchange.' It will be noticed that the King of Cashel takes with him steeds and manufactured articles from the southern princes, and that different princes are presented with different articles, most of them receiving swords, goblets, some of them coats-of-mail, chess-boards, mantles; the maritime parts accepting ships, female slaves (probably imported), etc., each, we may suppose, receiving those commodities which were most in demand in his particular territory; e.g., ships and slaves (for export) are the tribute to the chief who had sway over the port of Dublin; while the King of Cashel got in all cases provisions, services, and escorts in exchange. Of course it is possible that the northern princes might have needed, and the southerners might be willing to give, more of one article and less of another, than the stipulated sum, and this would be a matter of mutual arrangement; it may even be possible that some sort of money passed in the transaction, but it is remarkable that the dues are expressed simply in kind without any reference to a common standard, so that it would seem that not even 'cow money,' much less coined money, was in use.

I may fittingly conclude this chapter and subject with an ancient account of the manner in which Brian Boru

¹ Keating, *Hist.*, Bk. ii. sec. 17. The *Book of Rights* is full of such examples.

replenished his larder and wine-cellar at Kincora; and the reader will notice that there is frequent mention of bars of iron therein, but no allusion to the precious metals, silver or gold :—

Here follow the tribute and dues that Brian Boroimhe claimed from the provincial kings of Ireland outside of Munster for the upkeep of the house of Ceann Choradh, as stated by Mac Liag, chief ollamh of Ireland, in the poem which begins : ‘ Boraimhe town of the kings.’ In the first place he got from the province of Connaught 800 cows and 800 hogs ; . . . from Tir Chonaill 500 mantles and 500 cows . . . from Tir Eoghain 3 score cows and 3 score pigs and 3 score bars of iron . . . from the clann Rudhruighe of Ulster thrice 50 cows and thrice 50 hogs ; he got 800 cows from Oirghialla ; 300 hogs, 300 beeves and 300 bars of iron from the province of Leinster ; 3 score cows, 3 score pigs and 3 score bars of iron from Osruighe ; he got from the Lochlonnaigh of Ath Cliath [i.e., the Northmen of Dublin] thrice 50 vats of wine ; and . . . from the Lochlonnaigh of Luimneach [i.e., the Northmen of Limerick] a tun of red wine every day in the year. . . .

It is to be inferred from the amount of meat and wine that was fixed for the support of the household of the court of Ceann Choradh, that, with the exception of Cormac, son of Art, and Conaire Mor, son of Eideir-sceol, there was none among the kings of Ireland who had a larger household and more followers and who kept up a more princely house than Brian.²

P. NOLAN, O.S.B.

[*To be continued.*]

² Ibid. ii. 25.

WHEN WAS OUR LORD BORN ?

BY REV. L. CARDWELL, S.J.

AMONG the many problems which arise when we attempt to connect Our Lord's life with the contemporary history of the world there are few which present greater difficulties than the question of the date of the Nativity. For many years the date known did not help, but rather hindered, a solution, and even in the light of more recent research the problem is still difficult of solution. The object of this paper is to set forth as clearly as possible the relevant facts and the conclusions that may be drawn from them. For the facts and the theory built upon them we are indebted to the discoveries and writings of archaeologists like Sanclemente, Marucchi, and de Rossi, to the work of Mommsen and of Sir William Ramsay.¹

St. Luke dates Our Lord's birth by a census, which took St. Joseph and Our Lady to Bethlehem, where Jesus was born. His words may be rendered literally, thus : ' It happened that at that time a decree had been issued by Cæsar Augustus that the whole world should be enrolled. This census—the first—took place while Quirinius was governing Syria ' (Luke ii. 1, 2). We have, then, the following statements : A general census was ordered and took place ; this census was the first taken in Palestine ; Quirinius had charge of Syria at that time.

As to a census in Judea under Quirinius there has never been any difficulty. Josephus (*Ant.* 18, i. 1) tells us that Quirinius came to Syria to take the census, and for that purpose personally visited Judea, which had just been annexed as a Roman province. To Josephus this census was

¹ See especially *Was Christ Born in Bethlehem ?* (1898) ; *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament* (1915).

interesting, because it marked the final stage in the complete loss of Jewish independence and was the occasion of a rising. But this is not the census to which St. Luke refers, for it took place about A.D. 6, whereas we know from St. Matthew that Our Lord was born before the death of Herod the Great, in 4 B.C. This apparent contradiction has been much used by rationalistic critics as a decisive proof of the inaccuracy and unreliability of the Gospels, but it is significant of the change of attitude that has occurred that we hear much less now of this so-called error of the Evangelist.

The subject can be attacked from two different sides—that of the history of Quirinius and that of the Augustan census system. Taking first the life of Publius Sulpicius Quirinius, we learn, chiefly from Tacitus, that Quirinius was of obscure origin, rose by his abilities as a leader to military honours, including, in all probability, the office of praetor in Africa, and was made consul by Augustus in 12 B.C. Soon after this, Tacitus informs us, he subdued the Homonadenses from Cilicia, and then was sent as an adviser to Gaius Cæsar, an adopted son of Augustus, in charge of Armenia. The famous Tiburtine inscription, which, though the portion bearing the name has not been found, is unanimously attributed by the leading archaeologists to Quirinius, mentions his success in a war which seems to be that against the Homonadeis. It further tells us that he later held the office of proconsul in Africa, after which he was ‘a *second time*’ (‘*iterum*’) legate of Augustus over Syria and Phœnicia. The unanimous verdict of those best able to judge, that this inscription gives the life-story of Quirinius, cuts the ground away from under those critics who had ridiculed St. Luke as historically untrustworthy, and capable of getting an important date wrong by ten years.

But only a part of the difficulty from this side is as yet removed. We know—chiefly from Josephus—the names of the governors of Syria about this time, and can approximately fix their dates. We find that in the years between

13 B.C. and A.D. 6 there is no long period vacant, except the two years 3-2 B.C., for which the governor's name is not known. But as the date of Herod's death, which is after the Nativity, is almost certainly 4 B.C., we cannot place the first *legatio* of Quirinius in this interval, a solution which otherwise, in the light of the historical knowledge of twenty years ago, seemed to Mommsen reasonable. The ordinary historians, of course, not excluding their leader, Mommsen, said that if the Gospels did not agree with history as known to them, then so much the worse for the Gospels. But in this case, as in so many others, historical theories have had to suffer correction to agreement with the Gospels, and not *vice versa*.

We turn then to the evidence which now makes it possible to date the first governorship of Quirinius on historical grounds at a period which also harmonizes with the chronology of the Gospel. The event by which the date is fixed is the Homonadensian war. The Homonadeis were a wild tribe of hillmen, dwelling in the fastnesses on the Northern slopes of the Taurus mountains, to the south of Antioch of Pisidia. They were a predatory people, and a constant plague to the dwellers in the Galatian lowlands. In 25 B.C. Amyntas, one of the petty kings, attempted to subdue them, but after an initial success, his army was defeated and he himself slain. By his will he bequeathed his kingdom to Augustus, and with the acceptance of the inheritance the religious obligation of vengeance was incurred by the heir. On account of the disturbed state of the Empire the execution of this duty was delayed till after 13 B.C. When peace and order had been in the main restored, Augustus was free to avenge Amyntas and protect the Galatians from the attacks of the Homonadeis. Mommsen, using the data available in the eighties, felt compelled to date the war in 3-2 B.C., but, even apart from the more recent evidence, it seems improbable that Augustus put off the fulfilment of his obligations so long, and left the Galatians to be harried by the hillmen for another ten years.

That the reduction of this tribe was an event of some importance is indicated in several ways. In the first place it won for this obscure tribe mention in a number of writers : Tacitus, Pliny, Strabo ; but further—a more significant fact—it merited for Quirinius the honours of two supplications and the triumphal insignia, as we learn from the Tiburtine inscription. A supplication might be awarded for a notable victory or a successful campaign, the *ornamenta triumphalia* would be granted to a general at the end of a war which he had won. The actual warfare in this case was not such as to give opportunity for victory in a single battle—being much more of the guerilla type—so we must conclude that it involved two distinct campaigns. Thus the awards given point to a fairly lengthy struggle and indicate that it was of sufficient importance to deserve, in the eyes of the Roman authorities, the high honours mentioned. The difficulty of the task and the probability of a fairly long war will be more evident if we consider the nature of the country. Strabo tells us that the Homonadeis dwelt ‘on the highest plateaux of Taurus, almost inaccessible and amidst precipices. These overhung a fertile valley, cultivated by people who lived among the overhanging cliffs and caves. For the most part, however, they lived by fighting, making predatory raids into the fields of the peaceful townlands and then returning to the protection of their natural fastnesses.’ This description¹ may be visualised, on a small scale, by anyone who is familiar with the scenery at the head of Wastwater. Fighting under such conditions would naturally be of quite unusual difficulty, and we are not surprised to find that the forty-four villages of the tribe had to be reduced, as Strabo tells us, singly by starvation. Progress in a country so difficult and with a mode of warfare so expensive of time must have been extremely slow. Furthermore, this country, where even the single traveller finds his journeys laborious at the best of times, becomes quite impassable during the winter

¹ *Strabo*, Bk. xii. pp. 569 ff.

months, owing to the unbearable cold, the deep-lying snow, and the absence of roads. The troops, too, had to be brought from their cantonments in Syria, probably on the Euphrates, through more than 250 miles of mountainous country, to the neighbourhood of Pisidian Antioch. This was inevitable, for the prætorian province of Galatia, from the borders of which the war was waged, had very few troops. The defence of that part of the Empire was entrusted to the legions in Syria—at this date three—under the command of the governor of Syria, and to him it accordingly fell to undertake the campaign.

The sequence of events would be somewhat as follows : Leaving Rome about April, when navigation had begun, Quirinius would travel by sea to Syria, and there the summer months would be spent in attending to urgent business, collecting the troops, mainly quartered on the eastern frontier of Syria, and transporting them through the mountainous defiles of Cilicia into Galatia. When this and the other preparations were completed, winter would be too near to permit of serious operations in the mountains. Consequently the fighting really began with the approach of the next summer, when the mountains had become habitable and the tracks could be used. The reduction of the villages, impregnable in their rocky fastnesses, proceeded gradually, till, with the approach of winter, the troops had again to retire to the townlands. The succeeding summer saw the tribe completely vanquished, their villages razed to the ground, and the people slain or enslaved. Each summer's success would be acknowledged by a *supplicatio*, and when all was over Quirinius was rewarded by the grant of the triumphal insignia—the laurel crown, the *toga picta*, the crowned statue. After the conclusion of hostilities, the troops had to be moved back through Cilicia to their stations in Syria and the internal affairs of the province set in order. Thus the carrying out of the entire campaign must have been a lengthy process, involving a tenure of office by Quirinius of not less than three years, and perhaps longer. We cannot then fit his first governorship into the

bare two summers of 3 and 2 B.C., which Mommsen adopted as the only vacant period. Mommsen's date for Quirinius being for this and other reasons unacceptable—in particular because it makes St. Luke contradict St. Matthew—we cannot follow him in his attempt to date the war by Quirinius, but must date Quirinius by the war, trying to fix this latter by other evidence.

We have already found the first indication in the state of the Empire. We have seen that Augustus became free to attend to lesser matters of administration about 13 B.C., which is confirmed by his recall of Agrippa, his son-in-law, from the special regency of the East entrusted to him. We should naturally conclude that the unruly Homonadeis would be taken in hand in the course of the next few years. Indeed, it looks as if Augustus had nominated Quirinius, a man of obscure origin and without powerful connexions, to the consulate—an honorary position—in 12 B.C., precisely in order to enable him to hold the Syrian command for which consular rank was required. So again we naturally conclude that the war took place soon after his consulate. But here we are met by the difficulty of the *lex Pompeia*, which enjoined a five years' interval between high office in Rome and a provincial governorship. This law, which had become obsolete, was revived by Augustus in 27 B.C., and later was again allowed to lapse. Accordingly, if this law was rigidly observed, Quirinius would not be eligible for the Syrian post till about 6 B.C. This is not too late, according to the Gospel accounts, but our historical data render an earlier date more suitable. The best authorities are, however, agreed, that this law need not prove an obstacle to the immediate promotion of Quirinius, who had been made consul simply to enable him to be governor of Syria as soon as possible. Concerning the legislation of which the *lex Pompeia* formed a part, Mommsen himself says that it was only partially observed in the imperial provinces—such as Syria—the rule being more rigidly enforced in the senatorial provinces.

Thus the evidence so far considered suggests that

Quirinius was governor of Syria, for three to four years, soon after 12 B.C. More conclusive evidence has been brought to light by the workers under Sir William Ramsay, who is recognized as the leading modern authority on Roman Galatia. First of all we have the discovery that Quirinius was duumvir of Pisidian Antioch, being succeeded in that office by his friend, M. Servilius, who was, in all probability, governor of Galatia—a praetorian appointment—in the years 7–6 B.C. His duty would be to co-operate with Quirinius in the war against the Homonadeis, and it seems probable that this war was the occasion of Quirinius being chosen duumvir.

The justification of this statement is to be found in the character of the individuals on whom this office—the honorary supreme magistracy in the colony—was conferred. It was an honour, reserved as a rule for members of the imperial house, the rare exceptions being due to great eminence in other ways. Cheeseman¹ finds only four cases where the office was bestowed outside the imperial family, four being friends of the reigning Emperor, and the fifth—P. Cornelius Dolabella—a legate conducting a campaign as governor of a province, just as in the case of Quirinius. In the case of Antioch, Drusus—the step-son of Augustus—held the post, twice—in 10 and 9 B.C.—as also did Domitius, the father of Nero. Now Tacitus describes Quirinius, obviously with contempt, as of quite obscure birth, from a small Italian town, and having no high family connexions, and shows us that he was disliked by the Roman nobility. It would seem, then, that the only reason for his election to this dignity was that he was the legate of Augustus, a man holding the most important command in the East, and engaged or recently victorious in the war that was so vital to the *coloni* of Antioch. This information is derived from an inscription on the base of a statue erected to a certain Caristanus, who was prefect for Quirinius the duumvir. Caristanus proudly proclaims the fact that his was the

¹ *Journal of Roman Studies*, 1913.

first statue to be thus publicly erected in the town. Now Antioch was refounded as a Roman colony about 24 B.C., while the duumvirate of Quirinius must have been several years before the statue on the base of which it is commemorated. Thus we see that were we to put Quirinius' *legatio* in the year 3-2 B.C., and the statue, say, in 1 B.C., no such civic memorial would have been decreed for more than twenty years, which seems out of harmony with Roman ideas and customs. Further, Quirinius was followed as duumvir by M. Servilius, who probably held the office in 7 or 6 B.C. For these and other reasons Dessau—the learned editor of the *Corpus Inscriptionum*—and other experts agree that the inscription and statue should be dated about 6 B.C. We have seen that it is natural to attribute Quirinius' election to the honour of duumvir to his previous success in the Homonadensian war—indeed Caristanius boasts of his military honours in a second very similar inscription—and so we may believe that the Homonadensian war was fought at some time in the period 11-8 B.C.

But further evidence is to hand. There were in this district five colonies, founded some time after 12 B.C., and intended to serve as small garrisons, to keep the country quiet when once the main resistance of the tribesmen had been broken. Owing to their exposed position on the foothills of Taurus, and the length of the military roads—*viae sebastae*—which connected them (there were more than 150 miles of exposed road on the flanks of the tribal fastnesses), it is very unlikely that these colonies, with their road system, should have been founded till the end of the war. But several inscribed milestones have been found (C.I.L. iii. 6974, 12217, etc.), all bearing the date, the 18th year of Augustus, i.e., 6 B.C., from which it follows that the war cannot be placed later than that year. There is a good parallel to this in the case of the P. Cornelius Dolabella mentioned above; after successfully concluding a campaign in Dalmatia, he laid down a system of roads with the same purpose as the ones in Galatia.

The conclusion to be drawn from all this evidence is that the war against the Homonadeis, and, therefore, the first Syrian governorship of Quirinius, must have taken place in the interval 11 to 6 B.C. We are now faced with the difficulty that, as we have seen, there is no place for Quirinius as governor during these years. Great emphasis has been laid on this difficulty, but increasing knowledge—and it is important to remember how little we know with certainty about the administration of the Roman provinces—tends to lessen its force. The first thing to notice is that the prime function of an ordinary legate was to govern his province. He was sent out, not to an honorary sinecure, but to an office involving continuous labour, heavy responsibility, and constant attention. Now it is clear that Quirinius could not in practice give this attention to Syrian affairs whilst far away across the mountains, in Galatia, engrossed in a campaign. If it had been in the middle of Syria, matters would have been different, but in this case such double duty was out of the question. Yet the existence of persons of such high rank as a *rex socius*, like Herod, would not admit of Quirinius delegating his powers to a lower official. In fact Herod himself had held the post of procurator, the office next in dignity to that of governor.

The simplest solution, obviously, would be the appointment of a *second* legate to manage the internal affairs of Syria while Quirinius was in Galatia. Such an arrangement, when it implied two governors of equal standing, was, naturally, very rare, but it was not absolutely unknown. A case occurs in Africa, where, besides the proconsul, there were two *legati Augusti proprætores* of equal rank in A.D. 75, and both authorized the construction of roads, the milestones bearing the two names as those of the governors. The case of the great general Corbulo is strikingly parallel. After the death in A.D. 60 of Ummidius, the governor of Syria, Corbulo, who was commander-in-chief against the Parthians, was given the Syrian governorship; after three years he seems to have found the

burden too heavy, and so to Cestius Gallus was committed the administration of Syria, as Tacitus puts it, though without depriving Corbulo of his title, which we find still accorded to him on a monument erected during the rule of Gallus. The important point to bear in mind in all these questions is the great flexibility of the imperial administration, the military autocracy of the Emperor in his own provinces allowing him much greater freedom of appointment and tenure than was the case in the provinces still controlled by the Senate. In these the legislation affecting government was more rigidly adhered to; in the imperial provinces Augustus was much more free, but here he preferred to act with due observance of legal forms, and we shall see that it was possible to secure the double governorship without introducing an anomaly.

The information as to the governors of Syria given us by Josephus is not very full. We gather from him that Agrippa was in charge till 13 B.C. In relating the events of the next few years he makes a passing mention of a certain Titius (*Ant.* 16, viii. 6), a reference probably to be dated 10 B.C., and then of Saturninus—C. Sentius, not L. Volusius (legate in A.D. 4-5)—who, apparently, was in charge for about the next three years, and is mentioned by Tertullian as the official who took the census. To all these Josephus applies the title ἡγεμών (*praeses*, president), meaning either any governor of whatever rank, or specifically an official of the lower grades, instead of the technical πρεσβευτής, *legatus*. In fact the Jewish writer is, as we should expect, rather vague as to the details of the Roman bureaucracy, while he has an intimate—though, of this period, second-hand—knowledge of the actions by which the Roman rule affected the Jewish people.

On the one hand, then, we find that the first governorship of Quirinius, as fixed by the dating of the Homonadensian war, is to be placed between the years 11 and 6 B.C. On the other hand, the evidence of Josephus makes it almost as certain that Titius and Saturninus were ruling

the province during the greater part of this time, so that we must conclude that the unusual expedient of having two governors in charge was adopted. But it was possible greatly to diminish the exceptional character of this course of action. We shall shortly see that very probably a census—the first of its kind in this area, and, therefore, a work of unusual magnitude—was to be taken about 9 B.C. For such a purpose it was quite in order to appoint a special legate—*ad census accipiendos*—who, be it noted, had *full governing powers* and was the *equal* in rank of the ordinary governor. In Syria at this time there was the machinery of a census to be constructed, the census to be taken of people to whom it was unfamiliar, a war to be waged in another province, and all the ordinary administration of an important province to be carried on. Furthermore, at this particular time, the dissensions in Herod's family were giving considerable trouble to Augustus and his Syrian officials. It is evident that under these conditions the task of governing Syria was quite beyond the powers of any one man, especially as he was for much of his time two hundred miles away, across the Cilician mountains. Very naturally, then, Augustus solved the difficulty in the recognized way, by appointing Saturninus *legatus Augusti propraetore censibus accipiendis*. In this position Saturninus would have full governing power *ex officio*, and could, therefore, assist in the management of Syrian affairs to whatever extent Augustus might suggest. Thus the nominal governor, and the one to whom St. Luke would naturally refer as better known to the Gentiles, and, in particular, to St. Paul's converts in the provinces of Galatia and Asia, would be Quirinius; Josephus, however, mentions Saturninus because he was the actual arbiter of the quarrels in Herod's family, and had charge of the internal affairs of Syria; Tertullian, the jurist, mentions his name, because he is referring to the census records kept at Rome, in which Saturninus would be named as censor. We conclude that Quirinius was governor of Syria, assisted for part of the time by Saturninus, with the title of censor,

while he was engaged in the Homonadensian war, at some time in the period 11-7 B.C.

We have now to approach the subject from the other side, examining St. Luke's statement that an imperial census, the first of its kind in that region, was taken in Judea before Herod's death, in 4 B.C. We may note that some writers have interpreted *πρώτη* in St. Luke's text in a comparative sense, meaning 'earlier than,' so that the census would be dated, not during Quirinius' first governorship, but before that, or better, before his governorship in 6 A.D., during which there was a well-known census. But such a construction is rare in Greek, is not used elsewhere by St. Luke, and seems to be less suited to the purpose of bringing the passage into agreement with the most probable account of contemporary history.

Secondly, St. Luke's phrase, '*πάσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην*'—'the whole world,'—taking into account his very free use of *πάς*, merely means that 'part of the world which to him or his informant was the whole world—the East, and Rome as a centre of command, and does not necessarily mean the whole Empire. Hence it is not necessary to prove, as Schürer, in a narrow spirit, insists, that there was a simultaneous census throughout the Empire, but on historical grounds there is nothing against it. Cassiodorus—a sixth century writer—drawing on Hyginus Gromaticus, author, in the reign of Trajan, of a treatise on surveying, tells us that 'in the reign of Augustus the Roman world was surveyed and subjected to a census (*agris divisus censuque descriptus est*)' of which Hyginus drew up a summary. All that the critics can allege against Cassiodorus is to say 'Who can give us any guarantee that he did not derive his statement about the census from St. Luke?' I should say that Cassiodorus himself gives the guarantee, in that he is clearly using Hyginus, whose work has no other bearing on the passage. And it is unlikely that a pagan surveyor of the first century A.D. had read St. Luke's Gospel. But quite apart from this it has long been known from historians such as Tacitus, Dio Cassius, etc., that

censuses of various kinds were taken in Rome and in provinces of the Empire at various times.

Augustus himself tells us that he took three censuses throughout the Empire—probably confined to Roman citizens—in 26 and 7 B.C. and A.D. 14. We know of three which he ordered in Gaul in 27 and 12 B.C. and A.D. 14—these being of provincials rather than of Roman citizens. In fact the taking of a census seems to have been one of the ordinary features of the imperial administration. It is important not to confuse a census of Roman citizens, which would be confined to Italy and to the *municipia* in the provinces, with an imperial census of the provinces. It is of this latter that we need evidence. Further, we must note that there is nothing to indicate that a census need be taken all over the Empire at the same time. The times might very well be adjusted to local conditions, especially in the case of the first census of a series, which, by its unfamiliarity, would cause more difficulty and greater expenditure of money, men, and time, than later ones.

The way had been prepared for a census by a survey of the Empire begun under Julius Cæsar, and completed by Xenodotus, in the East, about 31 B.C. This may very well have included Judea, but it was not a census in the strict sense. That an imperial census was made by Augustus at some time is made certain by his composition of a *Breviarium Imperii*, containing, amongst other things, 'the numbers of citizens and allies under arms, of kingdoms and provinces,' etc.¹ Marquardt, the best-known writer on the Roman provinces, tells us that 'Augustus determined, in 27 B.C., to carry out this taking of a census, with no other object than the numbering of the population.'² 'It would not be an error to see in this measure [the 'initiation of the provincial census'] the most important and practical aspect of the financial organization accomplished by Augustus.'³ Hence the argument against the '*descriptio totius orbis*,' from the silence of the historians falls

¹ Tacitus, *Ann.* i. 11.

² *Staatsverwaltung*, Fr. trans. x. 275.

³ Loc. cit.

to the ground. As a matter of fact, the later writers, such as Cassiodorus and Suidas, are not silent; for the contemporary historians, Tacitus, Dio Cassius, Josephus, the details of administration possessed no interest, unless accompanied by a rebellion or connected with men or events of dynastic importance. Thus Tacitus makes no reference to the three censuses of Roman citizens made by Augustus himself and recorded by him on the Monumentum Ancyranum. This later period of the reign of Augustus, in which there is a marked absence of unusual events, is passed over by such writers in the briefest possible way. Thus it comes about that this is one of the most obscure periods of Roman history, so much so that of men holding the very highest offices of state we know nothing more than a name on a coin. We are, therefore, entirely dependent on archæology for our information about this period, and this science has come to our aid in a remarkable way.

One of the most valuable of the results of that search in Egyptian rubbish heaps which we call the Oxyrhynchus finds has been the discovery of papyri proving the existence of a regular imperial census-system. The investigators, under Professors Grenfell and Hunt, have found a series of actual census papers, which make it certain that a system of fourteen-year censuses was in full swing; the actual papers for the years from A.D. 33-4 on, i.e. 34, 48, 62, and so on, up to the third century, have been found, also that for the year 20. The investigators tell us: 'earlier than A.D. 20 the existence of the fourteen years' cycle is not directly attested, but there is plenty of indirect evidence'; and, again: 'there is good ground for believing that the censuses were held for 10-9 B.C. and A.D. 5-6.'¹ The evidence seems to point to the year 10-9 B.C. (i.e., the Egyptian year running from August 29, 10 B.C., to August 29, 9 B.C.), as the year in which the system originated. To these investigators it also seems undeniable that the

¹ *Oxyrh. Papyri*, ii. p. 207.

system was not peculiar to Egypt, but was imperial, being applied at least to the whole East. For we find these censuses taken, not according to the years of Augustus' rule in Egypt, i.e. from August 29, 30 B.C., but according to the ordinary or imperial reckoning, from June 29, 23 B.C. The force of the argument adduced by Grenfell and Hunt is, perhaps, most clearly brought out by the fact that Marquardt and also Wilcken, the leading authority on Roman economics, neither of whom is in any way anxious to support St. Luke, both accept the theory of an imperial census-system, beginning about 10-9 B.C. This part of the discussion may well be summed up in the words of the actual authorities:—

Professor Ramsay is on safe ground when he justifies from the evidence of Egyptian papyri St. Luke's statement that Augustus started, at any rate in part of the Roman world, a series of periodic enrolments, in the sense of numberings of the population, and since the census, which is known to have taken place in Syria in A.D. 6-7, coincides with an enrolment year in Egypt, if we trace back the fourteen years' cycle one step beyond A.D. 20, it is *prima facie* a very probable hypothesis that the numbering described by St. Luke was connected with a general census held for 10-9 B.C. Moreover, the papyri are quite consistent with St. Luke's statement that this was the first enrolment.¹

This important enrolment system, on the laborious discovery of which we pride ourselves, seems to have been taken for granted by the ancients. Pliny,² writing of a census in A.D. 48, assumes the system as well-known. Tacitus mentions censors for years which might fit the fourteen years' cycle. Clement of Alexandria³ tells us that Our Lord was born 'when first they ordered enrolments to be made,' thereby presupposing the system under which, as we now know, he himself lived. As a matter of fact, like most of the early Christian writers, he gives an impossible date—after Herod's death—for Our Lord's birth; in the matter of actual dates these early writers seem to have been quite at sea, a fact which will hardly cause surprise to those who have wandered in the mazes of Oriental chronology. When his chronology of the

¹ *Oxyrh. Pap.*, ii. p. 211.

² *N. H.*, vii. 48.

³ *Strom.*, i. 21.

Emperors is corrected, his date for the Nativity works out at 6 B.C. Tertullian, also, is a witness of great value, for he has a statement which is clearly independent of St. Luke, because it appears to contradict him. He says ¹ that Our Lord was born when the census was made in Judea by Sentius Satuminus (i.e., 9-6 B.C.), and he refers his readers to the archives themselves for the proof of his statement.² Thus the evidence of the early writers supports the already very probable hypothesis of an imperial census-system starting about the year 10-9 B.C.

It has been asserted that a census at that date in Judea is out of the question; for Josephus, a careful and detailed writer, says nothing about it, and also Judea was independent at the time, Herod, its ruler, not being a subject of Augustus, but a *rex socius*. With regard to the nominal independence of Judea this much can with probability be said, that, so far as we know, the Jews did not pay taxes directly to Rome at that time. We know that Herod was able, on his own authority, to remit part or all of the taxes when he wished, but, apart from this, we are almost completely in the dark. Even Schürer, a writer careful, at least, in his historical details, has no certain information to give. On the other hand, it is most probable that Herod continued to pay the tribute imposed on him by Antony as the price of his kingdom,³ for to the Roman the real *raison d'être* of the subject-peoples was to pay the expenses of Roman life and rule. The tribute to be paid by Herod would most naturally be estimated on the basis of a poll-tax, the simpler type of taxation, and the Romans may very well have taken the opportunity of revaluing Herod's contribution by a simple numbering—ἀπογραφὴ—such as St. Luke describes. Under these circumstances we may feel sure that Herod, knowing the extreme sensitiveness of his subjects, was able to take the precaution of seeing that the census was carried out in accordance with Jewish national customs. The result of an attempt to force Roman methods on this people is seen in the case

¹ *Adv. Marcion.*, iv. 19.

² *Op. cit.*, iv. 7.

³ *Appian.*, B.C., v. 75.

of the census of A.D. 6, which Josephus mentions, because it caused a revolt in Judea. Now the question is whether Herod's subjects would be counted when the rest of the East was enrolled. Much has been made of Herod's position as a *rex socius*, but to anyone acquainted with the character of the Roman Emperor, the idea of any semblance of equality between the mighty Augustus and a petty king, particularly Herod, who had received his title from the Roman Senate, is absurd. When Augustus wished a people to be enrolled it was enrolled, and the fact that he might choose to keep up a pretence of equality by a request or suggestion that Herod dared not refuse, makes no real difference. As for Herod, Firth well says of him: 'Always a vassal king, he accepted without demur the foreign policy of his master of the moment.'¹ That Augustus might choose to leave to the king the duty of ordering the census is clear from the very parallel case of Archelaus, king of a Cappadocian tribe, the Chietae. He attempted to impose on them a census in the prescribed *Roman* form, whereupon they revolted, and had to be reduced to order by Roman troops.²

As the Jews did not pay any direct taxes to the Emperor, it is quite probable that this enrolment was a mere numbering, distinct from the valuation of their property, 'the account of their estates' for taxation, as Josephus³ calls it, which the Jews resented so bitterly. We know that in Egypt, where there would seem to have been special reasons, the two were distinct, and it is at least not impossible that the one was introduced before the other in Palestine. We have seen that for the purpose of checking Herod's tribute the simple enrolment would suffice. The second or valuation type of census, denoting subjection, the Romans may very well have omitted till Judea should come into their hands again after Herod's death. The reason for enlarging on this matter is that it adequately explains the peaceful submission of the Jews

¹ *Augustus Caesar*, p. 282.

² Tacitus, *Ann.* vi. 41.

³ *Antiq.*, 18, i. 1.

to the earlier census, although that of A.D. 6 was bitterly resented. In the former case this proud people was numbered in their own way, the Roman authority being far away, at Antioch, in Syria, while they paid taxes to their own king; in the later census the hated Romans came personally into their land to brand them with the sign of subjection by inflicting on them a valuation of their property, to be taken in Roman fashion with a view to taxation for the benefit of their Roman masters. It was the lawfulness of this submission to the foreigner that troubled the national conscience and caused disturbances. The earlier census caused no trouble, and so we hear nothing of it.

Other objections have been raised to St. Luke's account of the Nativity, but none compare in importance with the ones here dealt with, and, like these, with the growth of knowledge, they are fast losing their apparent value. To sum up, then, as we study the evidence, whether in Asia, as affecting Quirinius himself, or in Egypt and elsewhere, as determining the Augustan census-system, or the statements of various writers, the evidence all points to the same period for the census by which St. Luke fixes for us the date of Our Lord's birth. This period is limited by the years 9-6 B.C. There is very little evidence by which we can fix narrower limits, but the probabilities seem to converge towards the years 8-7 B.C., and there, till further confirmatory evidences comes to light, we may leave the matter.

LAURENCE CARDWELL, S.J.

NOTES AND QUERIES

THEOLOGY

FAST ON HOLY SATURDAY

REV. DEAR SIR,—Canon 1252, § 4, seems to me to involve a considerable difficulty in regard to the fast on Holy Saturday. I can understand the law of abstinence coming to an end at midday, but the law of the fast should bind all day or not at all.

INQUIRER.

'Inquirer's' suggestion is very intelligible, and we have no doubt that many share his difficulty.

We have, in fact, a conflict of two principles—one a principle hitherto generally admitted as to the nature of the fast; the other the principle that 'laws are to be taken in their plain and obvious sense.' The whole question is, 'Which is going to prevail?'

One controversialist will argue in this way: 'It has always been agreed that the fast means one full meal per day—with the collation and frustulum introduced by custom and now sanctioned by law. The taking of anything more means the violation of the fast. It has also been universally admitted that the fast is one indivisible thing—one, indivisible obligation affecting, and attached to, the whole day. If we break it once, we cannot break it that day again; and if we are allowed to have more in the day than the fast allows, we are not bound to the fast at all. Now, Holy Saturday is a day like all the others. And on Holy Saturday—which, like all the others, comprises a forenoon and afternoon—we *are* allowed to have more than the fast allows. For, in the afternoon we may have as many full meals as we please—so far as Church legislation is concerned. Therefore, at no moment on Holy Saturday are we bound by the fast.'

This would have been good reasoning before the Code appeared. And it may be good reasoning still in regard to fast days generally. But we can imagine another controversialist putting the matter this way: 'Whatever about the fast generally and about other days, one thing is certain—we are bound by the fast on the forenoon of Holy Saturday. The law states 'cessat Sabbato Sancto post meridiem'; and there would be no meaning whatever in saying that a thing 'ceases' if, as a matter of fact, it has never begun to 'exist.' We are, therefore, obliged to have on Holy Saturday morning only just as much as on any other morning in Lent. Sometimes, of course, we are allowed to have a full meal on a forenoon in Lent, but—and this qualification will rule out Holy Saturday—only on condition that we have no other full meal that day.'

We must say we think the second exponent has the best of the argument. A clear implication in an individual law can hardly be set aside by an axiom, however consecrated by usage. The Code has introduced a novelty—a half-day fast—and we must interpret ancient axioms accordingly.

AN IMPLICIT DISPENSATION

REV. DEAR SIR,—Caius, a Catholic, was married some years ago to Bertha. Though she belonged nominally to a Protestant sect, it was well known to her friends, and to herself, that she had never been baptized: as a matter of fact, a dispensation in 'disparity of cult' was secured before the ceremony took place. It now transpires that the parties were third cousins—but no mention was made of the fact at the time, and no dispensation secured. So far as I can discover, indeed, the relationship was not suspected, even by themselves. Is the marriage valid?

In case you think it was, would you hold the same in spite of *other* unrevealed impediments?

ANGLICUS.

Our view is that the marriage is valid. 'Anglicus' does not say whether the event occurred before the Code came into force, or afterwards. In both hypotheses our opinion would be the same, but for different reasons.

If since 1918, manifestly there is no difficulty. Consanguinity in the fourth degree is no longer a diriment impediment; and when there is no impediment, obviously there is no need for a dispensation. There was one obstacle to validity; and that obstacle was removed by the dispensation actually given.

If before 1918, our opinion would be founded on the reply given on the 16th September, 1824, by the Holy Office to the Archbishop of Quebec: 'When the Church grants a Catholic a dispensation in difference of worship to contract marriage with a pagan, she is taken as granting a dispensation also from those impediments from which the pagan is exempt, so that the latter's exemption is thereby, on account of the indivisible character of the contract, communicated to the former also.'¹ That the reply, though given to an individual, was intended to express a general principle of action can hardly be doubted. It was embodied in the *Collectanea* of the Council of the Propagation,² confirmed by various subsequent replies, and to some degree even extended in its operation.³

¹ 'Ecclesia dispensando cum parte Catholica super disparitate cultus ut cum infideli contrahat dispensare intelligitur ab iis etiam impedimentis a quibus exempta est pars infidelis ut inde hujus exemptio propter contractus individuitatem communicata remaneat et alteri.'

² n. 1235.

³ As, for instance, by the declaration (22nd April, 1913), that the effect followed from a dispensation granted by a delegate, as well as from one emanating from the Holy See.

On the exact import of the concession the authorities are by no means in agreement.¹ But, whatever principles we adopt, it certainly extends to an impediment of the kind noted by 'Anglicus'—consanguinity in the fourth degree.

The differences of view just referred to are based on various considerations. We can only refer to them briefly, and give what we consider the most probable conclusions. It is agreed on all hands that the concession cannot apply to impediments that are, certainly or probably, imposed by the divine law. We may, therefore, rule out at once the impediments of impotence, previous marriage, consanguinity in all grades of the direct line and in the first of the collateral, essential defect in consent, error in regard to the person, conditions against the essence of marriage, etc. Some of these are, properly speaking, not 'impediments' at all, and are not classified as such in the New Code; but we take the term in the sense generally accepted at the date of the Quebec reply.

Secondly, it would seem that we must exclude the impediments of ecclesiastical law that affect the baptized person only—as distinguished from the 'relative' impediments that are based on facts common to both parties (such as the relationship of consanguinity). Authorities generally, when speaking of the 'indivisible character of the contract,' have had the latter only in mind—and the terms of the concession make it clear that the 'indivisible character of the contract' was the motive underlying the reply. By way of confirmation we may quote the words of Wernz. Speaking of this very instruction of 1824, he says: '*Dispensatio cum tantum detur super impedimentis a quibus pars infidelis directe est exempta, se etiam non extendit ad impedimenta soli parti catholice propria.*'² Our conclusion, therefore, would be that such impediments as sacred orders, solemn profession, defect in canonical age (affecting the baptized partner) are not contemplated in the general principle. And, indeed, we may add that common sense would have suggested the conclusion, even if we had no canonical principles to make it practically certain.

But even the list of 'relative' impediments must be curtailed considerably. It can hardly be imagined that the Church would grant in a casual, off-hand fashion, concessions that she refuses when the demand is made explicitly. We may, therefore, add to the list of exceptions such impediments as affinity in the first degree of the direct line, fear (which probably, also, is excluded under the first principle), public crime of the second and third classes, abduction, etc.

Making allowances of this kind, we find that the concession means much less than one might at first be inclined to suppose. It is restricted, in fact, to consanguinity in the collateral line outside the first degree, affinity outside the case above mentioned, spiritual relationship, adoption (where it still remains an impediment), and public propriety.

¹ Cf. Ojetti, *In jus. . . Ne temere*, 137, n. 2: Wernz, *Jus. Decr.*, iv, 40, etc.

² Loc. cit.

But, when we have made all the restrictions that the strictest principles imply, there is still enough remaining to justify 'Anglicus' in setting aside any conscientious scruples he may feel. The unrevealed impediment is certainly one of those that must have been contemplated in the Instruction of 1824. The Church, therefore, may be 'taken as granting a dispensation' in the case; and the marriage is valid.

A question might be raised about cases somewhat different from the one just discussed. Suppose that the ceremony took place after 1918, and that the unrevealed relationship were a real impediment of the kind for which a dispensation is usually given, would the marriage still be valid? The reply depends, of course, on whether the Instruction of 1824 remains in force under the new legislation. On that matter there may be two views. It may be contended that the old regulation has disappeared since there is no mention of it in the Code, and since the principle of 'indivisibility' (which the Instruction recognized and cited) has been rejected by the Code in the case of mixed marriages (1099, § 2). To this it will be perhaps enough to reply that a regulation of this kind—which embodies nothing further than a practical rule followed by a special Congregation—secures sufficient mention in the citation of the Instruction among the notes to Canon 1070; and that, as decisions prove,¹ the rule was followed in connexion with dispensations in difference of worship long after it had been discarded in the case of mixed marriage by the *Ne Temere* decree. At all events, there are grounds for serious doubt as to whether the previous law has been abolished; and, that being so, we are justified in maintaining its existence (Canon 6) until, if ever, a decision is given to the contrary.

FAST IN BAPTISM. RELIGIOUS AS SPONSORS. LOSS OF INDULGENCES

REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you kindly give a brief reply to the following queries:—

1°. What is the reason for the fast recommended in the Code (for baptizer and baptized) in Baptism?

2°. What is the canonical justification for excluding Religious from the office of sponsors?

3°. A commissions B to buy certain articles and have them blessed. B does so, and afterwards hands them over to A and receives the price. Are the indulgences lost? It would seem to be a sale, and Canon 924 states: 'indulgentiae . . . cessant . . . cum res . . . vendantur.'

X.

Replying to 'X.'s' queries in order:—

1°. Undoubtedly the reason is found in reverence for the sacrament. So much is suggested by the Ritual.² Ultimately that is the reason for

¹ e.g. the declaration of 1913 cited above.

² Tit. 2, c. 3, n. 8.

the Eucharistic fast itself. And we find traces of the same principle in the regulations prescribing the modified fast in the case of Ordination.

Of course, if the suggestions of the Code are fully carried out, we find another and more important reason in the case of the baptized adult. Unless there be grave obstacles in the way, he is to assist at Mass and receive Communion after the ceremony (753, § 2).

2°. From some points of view, 'X.'s' perplexity is reasonable enough. Seeing that the duty of sponsors is to undertake the spiritual guidance of the child in case its natural guardians fail, it might be concluded that the best qualified persons are precisely the excluded Religious. And, if no other considerations entered into the matter, undoubtedly the law would favour their admission. But other matters *have* to be taken into account. The Religious has renounced the world and placed himself at the disposal of his superior. He may, therefore, be placed in a position in which it will be impossible for him to discharge his duties—may be transferred, for instance, to another place and not allowed to return. The due discharge of his duties, too, might mean a greater interference with discipline, and perhaps involve the Order itself in graver difficulties than a prudent administrator would be likely to sanction. Inconveniences of this kind have been found in practice to outweigh the convenience on the other side. And the result is the present legislation—which reproduces substantially the pre-existing law.

3°. The legislation is certainly strict. The reply of the Congregation of Indulgences (16th July, 1887), set the standard: 'An, 1°, *res indulgentiis ditatae tradi debeant fidelibus omnino gratis, ita ut, 2°, si aliquid quocumque titulo, sive pretii, sive permutationis, sive muneris, sive elemosynae requiratur, vel accipiat, indulgentiae ex hoc amittantur?* Resp. *Affirmative ad utramque partem.*' It may be contended that all this is somewhat modified by the milder wording of Canon 924, § 2, of the Code. But, even granting the opposite, the reply does not cover the case submitted by 'X.' The objects belonged to A as soon as B had completed the purchase in his name or by his authority. The fact that A had not handed over the price before the transaction has no effect on the question. The articles were *his*—unpaid for, admittedly, but still *his*. The paying of the price is not a contract of buying: it is payment for a thing already bought. Nor does 'permutation,' 'gift,' or 'alms' come into question. The indulgences were attached to the objects *after* A had bought them, and remain unaffected by the subsequent transaction.

PRESUMED DEATH

The Instruction issued by the Holy Office in 1868 detailed the procedure to be followed by Ordinaries when the death of one married partner is in doubt, and when the other is anxious to contract a new marriage. The rules are marked by great prudence and moderation; they do not demand a high degree of certainty—which in many cases would be impossible—but merely such a standard of assurance as would

satisfy ordinary men in the important affairs of life. Local authorities have often exhibited far more anxiety in this connexion than the law itself or the Roman Congregations demand. A reply recently published¹ illustrates the situation; and, on that account, may be given a brief mention.

A Spanish farmer left his home in 1902 or 1903 and went to the Argentine. He had business there; was thirty years old and in good health; and his wife assented to the expedition. For two years he lived in Santa Fé, wrote to his wife and friends repeatedly and enclosed some money, but disappeared suddenly, in 1905, and left no trace. One witness, who had lived with him in Santa Fé, testified that he went off that year to a distant portion of the country and that nothing further was heard of him. His mother—who refused to give evidence because she was opposed to the re-marriage of her daughter-in-law—was alleged by other witnesses to have once seen a letter, written from the Argentine, in which it was vaguely stated that ‘a certain member of the locality would never return again.’ He was of good character, lived in a religious manner, and was attached to his wife and relatives. Several enquiries were made. His father-in-law and mother-in-law, who also went to the Argentine, could find no trace of him: his relatives interviewed returning Americans, but never got news of him; and the investigations of the Spanish Consul in Santa Fé were equally without effect.

In these circumstances, his wife thought herself justified in contracting a second marriage. But the Bishop of the place refused to give any decision. And, of course, we can easily appreciate his difficulties—and the difficulties of everyone else who is called upon for a decision in similar circumstances. He may have said to himself that, if the absentee had intended to do anything that would bring discredit on his family, this is precisely the course he would have adopted—he would have disappeared and, as far as possible, covered up all trace of his existence. He was a moral and religious man—but these good qualities are not absolutely permanent. His very attachment to his wife and family, which may have survived his other virtues, would lead him to shield them from disgrace. *If*, then, this is the course he would have taken in certain circumstances, how does the fact that it *was* taken prove that these were not the circumstances in the case?

Anyhow, the Bishop referred the matter to the Holy Office. He was told, in reply, to follow the procedure of 1868. Still unsatisfied with the evidence, he wrote again that ‘nothing more could be added: there were no direct arguments to prove the death of the man; but, all things considered, perhaps there were not wanting indications from which his death might be inferred. Since the whole thing, however, seemed to him uncertain, he willingly submitted it to the Sacred Congregation.’

The Sacred Congregation evidently took a more lenient view. The certainty he was in search of was more than the case demanded. The decision took the simple form: ‘Omnibus circumstantiis mature

¹ *Acta Apostolicæ Sedis* (1922), n. 4, pp. 96, 97. For text of Document see p. 327 *infra*.

perpensis, ad dubium, "An oratrici permitti potest transitus ad alias nuptias in casu" responderunt (Patres) *Affirmative.*'

Which is quite in harmony with all previous decisions. We have rarely seen the records of a case in which, when the Bishop found himself in a state of reasonable doubt, the Congregation failed to give a decision in favour of liberty. The object of the investigation is to discover, not what may *possibly* have happened, but what ordinary men would pronounce the most likely conclusion. The policy of the Congregation evidently is to provide for the nine cases in which the decision will be correct, rather than for the one in which the divine law will be—objectively—violated.

M. J. O'DONNELL.

CANON LAW

A BISHOP'S POWER TO ORDER THE APPLICATION OF MASS FOR A DEFINITE INTENTION VIEWED IN THE LIGHT OF A RECENT DECISION OF THE CONGREGATION OF THE COUNCIL

REV. DEAR SIR,—In view of a decision of the Sacred Congregation of the Council and of the discussion which preceded it, published in the *Acta Apostolicæ Sedis* of November, 1920, many priests are inclined to think that a Bishop cannot impose on his priests an obligation to offer Mass for any specified purpose; and hence, for example, they conclude that a diocesan statute requiring priests to apply a Mass or Masses for a deceased Bishop or priest is not strictly obligatory. Would you kindly discuss this question in the I. E. RECORD and state whether this view may be safely followed?

INQUIRER.

It is scarcely necessary to say that this is a question of the greatest practical importance. As most of our readers are aware, a statute of this kind is to be found in very many, if not all, of the dioceses of this country, and, consequently, it concerns the general body of the clergy to know whether it should be regarded merely as a recommendation and exhortation, or rather as a strict law, imposing an obligation in conscience.

The decision of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, to which reference is made in the query, of itself affords not the slightest ground for holding that a Bishop may not impose on his priests an obligation to offer Mass for some specific object. The matter before the Congregation was concerned with an indult received by a certain Bishop from the Holy See, by which he could dispense his priests from the prohibition against receiving a stipend for a bination Mass and from the obligation

of applying the Mass *pro populo* on suppressed holidays, provided, however, the stipend in both cases was handed over to the Seminary. In order that the stipend might be secured with certainty for the Seminary, the Bishop obliged the priests to offer the Masses in question for his intention; and the precise point at issue was whether the indult justified him in this procedure. The answer was that it did. Clearly, therefore, it affords not the slightest foundation for the view in question.

The theory that a Bishop cannot oblige his priests to offer Mass for a specified object is deduced, we believe, from the following passage in the summary of the arguments advanced by the consultor or consultors who favoured the negative side in the preliminary discussion: 'According to the present discipline only religious superiors prescribe for their subjects the intentions of their Masses. That is never done by Bishops, very rarely by the Pope, who, without doubt, can do it, as he did it, e.g., whilst the war was raging, on the Feast of the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, 1918. Indeed, seeing that many dioceses are weighed down by very heavy burdens, it was not inopportune to consider the question of making a law, or introducing a custom, that a priest who bination should celebrate the bination Mass for the intention of the Bishop, and that parish priests on suppressed feasts should also celebrate, for a stipend to be applied to the needs of the diocese, the Mass which would otherwise be offered without a stipend for their flocks. But, in the present or already established law, since Bishops cannot, either by law or precept, impose unusual obligations, they must be denied the faculty of prescribing the application of the parochial Mass on suppressed feasts and the bination Mass, in favour, for example, of the Seminary.'¹

Briefly, this argument, so far as it is applicable to the question under discussion, is the following: Bishops cannot impose unusual obligations; but according to the present discipline Bishops do not prescribe intentions for Masses; therefore they cannot do so.

The proposition, 'Bishops cannot impose unusual obligations,' need not detain us long. It will be noticed that no proof of it is forthcoming; and it certainly is not a recognized maxim of Canon Law, nor has it ever obtained legal sanction. Personally, indeed, we do not believe that it is universally true; if, for example, episcopal power in any matter is expressly recognized by law, even though the power is rarely, if ever, exercised, there can be no doubt as to its existence. Whatever about the content and truth of this rather vague general proposition, if it can be shown that the minor of the syllogism is false, and that, under the present discipline, Bishops can and do prescribe intentions for Masses, or, in other words, oblige their priests on certain occasions to offer Mass for some specified object, then the whole argumentation falls to the ground.

What, then, is the present discipline in this matter? The Code has not legislated expressly on it, and hence we must fall back on the pre-

¹ *Acta Ap. Sedis*, Nov., 1920, p. 537.

Code teaching.¹ The latter is to be deduced mainly from the writings of canonists and moral theologians—in pre-Code days also there was no express law on the subject. Well, the writers who discuss this matter are unanimous, as far as we can find out, in holding that a Bishop may impose an obligation of this nature on his priests. It will be sufficient to quote from a few of the principal modern canonists and theologians. Wernz, in the following passage, is quite definite on the point:—

‘By reason of due obedience a priest may be obliged to celebrate Mass and even to apply it for a determinate object. The power of prescribing and prohibiting in the external forum the celebration and even the application of Mass by means of spiritual jurisdiction, exercised either by law or precept, belongs to the Pope, and to Bishops in regard to priests subject to them. For it is by no means a question of commanding or forbidding a merely external act, to which, in accordance with the common and better founded view, ecclesiastical jurisdiction does not extend. For the prescribed or prohibited celebration of Mass is of itself a mixed act, not a merely internal one; and the added command regarding the making or avoiding of its application has reference to the mixed act which is completed by that application.’²

Cardinal Gasparri’s testimony is substantially the same:—

‘Some taught that the Pope, and a Bishop, could not forbid or command priests to apply a Mass for some object, since the application of Mass seems to be a merely internal act. This doctrine is false. For the Pope or a Bishop in the case commands or forbids the celebration of Mass with that application, that is, the external act which the internal act accompanies and completes; and there is no doubt that they can command such an act. Nor are there wanting examples of this prohibition and precept. . . . In the archdiocese of Paris all priests attached to the diocese are bound, on the 12th November, to celebrate and apply a requiem Mass for all the deceased priests of the diocese; and those who on that day are prevented from celebrating this Mass must satisfy the obligation as quickly as possible. Gregory XVI endowed this pious practice with indulgences, and thus approved it. But the Holy See, if in certain grave circumstances it commands the celebration, does not usually require its application. Bishops should imitate this prudence of the Holy See, and only rarely impose on priests the application of Mass which would deprive them of a stipend of which, perhaps, they may be in need.’³

Lehmkuhl’s teaching is the same:—

‘Can a superior, in other circumstances, impose the same obligation by law or precept? Nobody denies that the celebration of Mass can be prescribed for a just cause; some deny that its application can be

¹ Canon 20: ‘Si certa de re desit expressam præscriptum legis sive generalis sive particularis, norma sumenda est . . . a communi constantique sententia doctorum.’

² *Jus Decret.*, tom. iii. n. 538.

³ *De Sanctissima Eucharistia*, vol. i. n. 638.

commanded, because this is a purely internal matter. . . . In the use of this power justice must be taken into consideration, lest a priest, who would otherwise receive a stipend, should suffer serious loss. Wherefore, Bishops should rarely use such a precept, seeing that the Pope himself, although he can do so, is not accustomed to command such application.' ¹

Many, too, is quite definite in the assertion of episcopal power in this matter :—

'If a Superior, for example, a Prelate in regard to Regulars, or a Bishop in regard to Secular priests, orders the application of Mass for a determinate intention, subjects are bound to apply the Mass for this intention, as is evident from the very nature of the case.' ²

If it were necessary, such quotations might be continued almost indefinitely; those given, however, are quite sufficient to show that under the existing discipline Bishops may oblige their priests to celebrate and apply Mass for some specified object. Lest, however, the requirements of justice should be violated, this power should be only rarely exercised.

It is scarcely necessary to state that Bishops have utilized this power. The statutes of many dioceses in Ireland, which prescribe Masses for deceased Bishops and priests, are sufficient proof of that. There is also the testimony of Cardinal Gasparri, quoted above, in reference to a similar statute of the archdiocese of Paris and to its approval by Gregory XVI.

The proposition that, 'Bishops, according to the present discipline, do not prescribe intentions for Masses,' therefore, collapses, and with it the whole argument. In justice to those who put it forward we must express our doubt as to whether they meant it to be taken in its complete universality. The point in dispute had reference to bination Masses and Masses on suppressed holidays, and, so far as these were concerned, the argument was correct enough; and it seems probable that it was not meant to be extended further. It is hardly credible that a Consultor of the Congregation of the Council would be ignorant of the teaching on this point of such prominent modern canonists as Wernz and Gasparri.

It is scarcely necessary to state formally that we regard these diocesan statutes which prescribe a Mass or Masses for a deceased priest or Bishop as quite valid, and that we consider that they express a strict obligation in conscience, not merely a recommendation or exhortation.

VERNACULAR TRANSLATIONS OF EPISTLES AND GOSPELS FOR SUNDAYS

REV. DEAR SIR,—Does 'cum adnotationibus,' in Canon 1391, apply to vernacular translations of the Epistles and Gospels for Sundays? An authoritative answer in the I. E. RECORD would greatly oblige.

AN AFRICAN MISSIONER.

Canon 1391 states that: 'Versions of the Sacred Scriptures in the

¹ *Th. Moralis*, vol. ii. n. 206, ed. 10.

² *De Missa*, n. 57.

vernacular cannot be printed unless they are approved by the Holy See, or unless they are published under the vigilance of the Bishop and with notes ("cum adnotationibus") drawn especially from the holy Fathers of the Church and from learned Catholic writers.' Even if this canon were to be interpreted apart altogether from pre-Code discipline, it would seem much more likely that it is not applicable to vernacular translations of the Epistles and Gospels for the Sundays; collections of extracts from the Sacred Scriptures in the vernacular can scarcely be called versions of the Sacred Scriptures, except in a very loose sense. In the light of pre-Code teaching, however, this view becomes certain. One of the rules of the Constitution *Officiorum et munerum*¹ was practically identical with the present canon, and canonists were unanimous, we think, in giving it this interpretation. Let us quote a couple of those who have touched on this point. Wernz' comment is the following: 'Parts of Sacred Scripture, such as the Epistles and Gospels of the year . . . can be published without notes on the authority of the Bishop.'² Hurley is just as explicit: 'The aim and scope of this rule suggests two questions: What of a *Montessaron* of the Gospels or any such work, composed, indeed, of words or passages taken from the Sacred Scriptures and arranged so as to form a treatise? Would such works come under the present rule, and accordingly require to be annotated with passages from both the Fathers and from approved theologians in order that a Bishop might approve of it? In reply, I should say that such works are rather treatises on Sacred Scripture than editions; and accordingly that a Bishop may give approval of them just as he might of a commentary on a part of Sacred Scripture.'³

THE CONSENT OF THE ORDINARY NECESSARY FOR THE ACCEPTATION OF PIOUS FOUNDATIONS. THE VESTING OF ECCLESIASTICAL PROPERTY

REV. DEAR SIR,—1°. I shall be grateful if you can inform me whether a corporate body, such as a chapter, may inherit monies carrying with them perpetual Mass obligations without the consent of the Ordinary.

2°. It is the obvious duty of the Ordinary to prevent the dispersal or mis-application of funds raised parochially in his diocese for charitable purposes. The Westminster Synods are insistent

¹ Rule VII: 'Cum experimento manifestum sit, si Sacra Biblia vulgari lingua passim sine discrimine permittatur, plus inde ob hominum temeritatem detrimenti quam utilitatis oriri, versiones omnes in lingua vernacula, etiam a viris catholicis confectae, omnino prohibentur, nisi fuerint ab Apostolica Sede approbatae, aut editae sub vigilantia Episcoporum cum adnotationibus desumptis ex Sanctis Ecclesiae Patribus, atque ex doctis ecclesiasticisque scriptoribus.'

² *Jus Decret.*, tom. iii. n. 111, nota 57, p. 114.

³ *Catholic Legislation on Literature*, pp. 75, 76.

that such funds should be registered, not in the name of the *parochus* alone, but in his own name and in the name of some other prudent persons. Were the Ordinary to claim the right, independently of the subscribers, to be himself co-opted upon the body of trustees, would these be bound canonically to admit the justice of his claim?

FIDES QUAERENS INTELLECTUM.

1°. An inheritance of the kind mentioned by our correspondent is a pious foundation, as is evident from the description of the latter, contained in Canon 1544, § 1: 'Nomine piarum foundationum significantur bona temporalia alicui personae morali in Ecclesiae quoquo modo data, cum onere in perpetuum vel in diuturnum tempus ex redditibus annuis aliquas Missas celebrandi vel alias praefinitas functiones ecclesiasticas explendi, aut nonnulla pietatis et caritatis opera peragendi.'

Canon 1546, § 1, states clearly that a pious foundation, and consequently an inheritance such as the one in question, cannot be accepted without the consent of the Ordinary: 'Ut hujusmodi foundationes a persona morali acceptari possint, requiritur consensus Ordinarii loci in scriptis datus, qui eum ne praebeat, antequam legitime compererit personam moralem tum novo oneri suscipiendo tum antiquis jam susceptis satisfacere posse; maximeque caveat ut redditus omnino respondeant oneribus adjunctis secundum ejusque dioecesis morem.'

2°. Funds such as those contemplated in this query are ecclesiastical property and belong, in the eyes of Canon Law and in reality, to the particular ecclesiastical corporation for which they have been collected. Unfortunately, ecclesiastical corporations are not, as a rule, civil corporations also, and hence the need of a trusteeship to safeguard the property under the laws of the State. The Code has no explicit regulations on this matter, and hence the circumstances of this trusteeship must be determined by local authority; in defect of any rule by National or Provincial Councils, the Bishop, the chief administrator of ecclesiastical property in the diocese which he governs, can deal with such points as the composition of the trusteeship.¹ Consequently, in England—our correspondent is evidently concerned with this country—the Bishop, independently of the subscribers, may require that he himself be one of the trustees in whose name the funds are invested.

For Ireland, the Maynooth Synod has legislated on this point; Statute 422 expressly prescribes that the Bishop should be one of the trustees: 'Ne ob legis defectum bona ecclesiastica in alienas manus transeant, curae erit episcopo ut eorum tituli aut instrumenta accurate juxta legem civilem et in nomine trium aut quatuor Curatorum conficiantur. Hi vero curatores sint Episcopus dioeceseos, Parochus aut alius sacerdos cui bona commissa fuerint, Vicarius Generalis aut alius vir prudens et vitae integritate conspicuus et in hujusmodi rebus versatus.'

It may be of interest also to quote the regulations regarding the civil vesting of ecclesiastical property for the United States and the

¹ Cf. Canon 1519, § 2.

countries of South America. For the United States they are contained in the following statute of the Fourth Plenary Council of Baltimore: 'In Statibus in quibus civilis parochiarum vel coetum ecclesiasticorum incorporatio legalis quae cum legibus ecclesiasticis concordet, non existit, Episcopus ipsemet, lege in comitiis ferenda, corpus publicum seu persona moralis (*corporation sole*) constitui poterit ad bona totius dioecesis habenda et administranda; vel poterunt simili lege dioecesis bona committi Episcopi fidei (*in trust*) ut eadem nomine dioeceseos teneat in ejusque bonum juxta mentem Ecclesiae administret; vel denique Episcopus bona dioeceseos temporalia possideat et administret nomine suo proprio, illo nempe absoluto plenoque juris titulo, qui anglice vocatur *in fee simple*; quo in casu Episcopus omnino memor sit, se, quantumvis a potestate saeculari plenum ecclesiasticarum rerum sibi datum fuerit dominium, ex sacrorum canonum monitu dominum earum non esse, sed mere procuratorem.'²

In the United States, therefore, all ecclesiastical property is vested in the Bishop alone, either as a corporation sole, a trustee, or a procurator. The position in South America is governed by Statute 828 of the Plenary Council of Latin America: 'Quodsi instituta illa ecclesiastica, ex jure civili alicujus reipublicae, per summam injuriam, non admittuntur tamquam subjecta capacia possidendi bona temporalia, Episcoporum vel aliorum competentium Praelatorum ecclesiasticorum erit, consultis viris in jure civile peritis, et approbante Sede Apostolica, eos definire modos, quibus per titulos jure civili validos assecurentur bona ecclesiastica.'

SOME QUESTIONS IN REGARD TO THE POWERS OF A SUPERIORESS OVER HER SUBJECTS

REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you kindly reply to the following queries in the I. E. RECORD:—

1°. In a certain convent one of the nuns appealed from the decision of the local Superioress to the Provincial; and the latter acceded to her petition and reversed the decision in her favour. The local Superioress imposed a penance on this nun and subjected her to other inconveniences on account of her action in having appealed. Would you kindly state if the nun was within her rights in appealing; and, if so, was the local Superioress justified in imposing a penance upon her?

2°. The constitutions of a certain religious institute state that letters, except to higher superiors, *neque aperiantur neque transmittantur*, without the permission of the local Superior. Does this constitution justify a local Superior, not merely in opening and reading the letters of members himself, but also in reading them for the community?

3°. Has a Superioress the right to require her subjects to tell her what passes between them and their confessor in confession?

CHAPLAIN.

1°. The answers to the two points in this query are self-evident. Apart from any other consideration, the fact that the Provincial reversed the decision of the local Superior shows not merely that the nun was within her rights in appealing, but that her appeal was well founded. It is equally clear that the local Superioress was not justified in imposing the penance; penances are to be imposed, not for the exercise of legitimate rights, but for crimes or faults.

2°. This constitution certainly does not give the Superior the right to read the letters of members for the community: its terms are applicable only to the opening and reading of letters by the Superior himself, or by someone delegated by him for the purpose. At the same time, of course, he may use the knowledge which he acquires from the reading of the letters in the government of the community: it is partly for this purpose that the right is given. And hence, for example, if, from the reading of a letter a Superior discovers the existence of some crime, he can take the necessary means, in accordance with the circumstances, for its repression.

3°. The Superioress has no such right: to require her subjects to make such a revelation would be equivalent to demanding from them a manifestation of conscience, which is expressly forbidden by Canon 530.

J. KINANE.

LITURGY

MARRIAGE CEREMONY WITHIN THE SANCTUARY. RUBRIC OF THE BENEDICTION SERVICE. THE BLESSING OF THE MIRACULOUS MEDAL AND A TABERNACLE

REV. DEAR SIR,—Will you kindly answer the following queries in the next issue of the I. E. RECORD :—

1°. Is it in accordance with or against the rubrics for a priest to perform the marriage ceremony and to give the nuptial blessing within the sanctuary?

2°. In incensing the Blessed Sacrament with 'ductus duplex,' how many clicks against the chains are to be made? I have seen priests make three clicks, but are not two clicks the correct number?

3°. At 'Veneremur cernui' are we to prostrate ourselves, or simply bow our heads? What inclination is to be made at 'Gloria Patri'? Is the head simply to be inclined or must we bend head and shoulders?

4°. Is there a special blessing to bless and induldge the miraculous medal? A priest having the faculty to induldge

this medal uses the blessing for ' numismatum,'—are the indulgences applied ?

5°. In looking for some information regarding tabernacles, I noticed that you state in the I. E. RECORD, for November, p. 532, that ' the tabernacle should be blessed.' A writer in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. xiv. p. 424, says : ' A benediction of the tabernacle is customary but not prescribed.' Both you and he refer to a decree 4035, n. 4. Would you kindly tell me if there is any real discrepancy between your statement and that of the *Encyclopedia* ?

QUAERENS.

1°. The Ritual prescribes that the marriage ceremony should take place in the church and that the nuptial blessing is to be given during the Mass. It does not indicate where the bridal party should kneel for the ceremony, but the rubrics of the nuptial blessing demand that they should kneel somewhere near the altar. They should not, however, be brought within the sanctuary, either for the marriage ceremony or the nuptial blessing. Such a practice, viz., of allowing laics within the sanctuary during the course of an ecclesiastical function, is quite opposed to the prescription of the *Cæremoniale Episcoporum* (c. xiii. n. 13), and the repeated ruling of the Congregation of Rites.¹ O'Kane says² : ' Two seats or prie-dieus should be prepared for the bride and bridegroom, or at least convenient places assigned them near to and in front of the altar, *but not within the sanctuary* ' ; and Vavasseur³ is equally strong : ' Il n'est pas permis de placer dans la chœur les futurs époux et leurs invités.'

The prohibition, of course, does not extend to a side-altar, where there is no sanctuary in the strict sense, but even there, if there are altar rails, we think it will be more in conformity with the spirit of the rubrics to have the seats for the bride and bridegroom placed outside the rails.

2°. ' Two clicks against the chains ' are the correct number for a *double swing*, viz., one for the short swing and the other for the direction of the thurible towards the object or person to be incensed. ' To give a double swing the thurible is raised only once and when at the proper height it is directed towards the person or thing to be incensed, just by a slight and gentle motion, and then, with but a momentary delay, by a motion more definite and pronounced.'⁴

3°. At ' Veneremur cernui ' we should make a profound inclination

¹ Decr. 157 ; Decr. 175, 1258, 1288.

² *Rubrics of the Roman Ritual*, p. 30 (Supplem. New Edition).

³ *Manuel de Liturgie*, new edition, by R. P. Joseph Haegy, vol. i. p. 629.

⁴ O'Loan, *Ceremonies of Some Eccl. Functions*, p. 38. Needless to say ' clicks against the chains ' are not necessary for either a single or double swing of the thurible. Noise of the kind, though customary, is no part of the liturgical act.

of the head.¹ The profound inclination of the head is thus described by de Herdt²: 'Profunda capitis inclinatio fit magna capitis depressione, quae secum trahit aliquam humerorum inclinationem.' A like inclination is to be made at the 'Gloria Patri.'

4°. Yes, in the *Roman Ritual* (p. 219) there is a special blessing, entitled, 'Ritus Benedictionis et Impositionis Sacri Numismatis B.M.V. Immaculatae vulgo Médaille miraculeuse'; and we find a more elaborate rite outlined by rubricists³ when the occasion of conferring the medal calls for greater solemnity. For the mere blessing, however, and attaching the indulgences to the medal we do not think any form of words is necessary. Provided the priest has the requisite faculty, we believe a mere sign of the Cross suffices. We are not aware that the miraculous medal is an exception to the general rule outlined in the following decrees: (1) 'Utrum ad indulgentias applicandas crucibus, rosariis, etc., alius ritus sit necessarius praeterquam signum crucis a sacerdote, qui hanc facultatem accepit, factum? Resp. *Negative*'⁴; (2) 'Quando in indulto existit clausula: *In forma Ecclesiae consueta*, sufficitne signum crucis manu efformare super res benedicendas absque pronuntiatione formulae benedictionis et sine aspersione aquae benedictae? Resp. *Affirmative*.'⁵

5°. Before the issue of the decree of June 20, 1899, it would have been true to say that 'benediction of the tabernacle was customary but not prescribed,' but after the publication of that decree we fail to see how the statement can be justified, nor can we find any recent liturgical authority to subscribe to it. The question⁶ put to the Congregation was as follows: 'Utrum Sacrum Tabernaculum . . . sit benedicendum, priusquam sacra Eucharistia in illo recondatur?' ('Whether the holy Tabernacle should be blessed before the Blessed Sacrament is placed in it?'); and the answer was 'Affirmative.' The manifest meaning of the decision is that 'the tabernacle should be blessed'; and the citation of the authority of the *Catholic Encyclopedia* is surely not sufficient to alter it. Indicative of the teaching of recent liturgical authorities on this point are the following: (a) 'It is now certain that the tabernacle must be blessed before the Blessed Sacrament is placed in it' (O'Kane, *Rubrics of the Roman Ritual* (1921), p. 279); (b) 'Tabernaculum benedicendum est, antequam SS. Eucharistia in eo reponatur' (De Amicis, *Cerem. Paroch.*, vol. i. p. 23); (c) 'Le Saint Sacrement doit être conservé dans un tabernacle fixé au milieu de l'autel et *bénit*' (Vavasseur, *Manuel de Liturgie*—new edition, by R. P. J. Haegy, 1921, p. 45); (d) 'Hodie extra dubium est ipsum Tabernaculum esse benedicendum, priusquam Sacra Eucharistia in illo recondatur' (Van der Stappen, *Sacra Liturg.*, vol. iv. p. 121).

¹ Wapelhorst, *Comp. Sacr. Liturg.*, cap. 21, n. 217.

² Vol. i. n. 121.

³ Vide *Cerem. Paroch.*, by De Amicis, vol. ii. p. 390.

⁴ Decc. Auth. S. C. Indul., 281 ad 5^{um}.

⁵ Ibid. 313 ad 2^{um}.

⁶ Decc. 4035 ad 4.

THE LITANY OF LORETTO. THE USE OF THE STOLE AT THE ROSARY AND FUNERALS. A PRIVILEGE OF THE 'PIA UNIO'

REV. DEAR SIR,—I shall feel grateful if you will kindly answer the following questions in one of the coming numbers of the I. E. RECORD:—

1°. Am I right in saying that this is the correct way of reciting the Litany of Loretto (and other Litanies also):

Priest: Kyrie eleison. *People*: Christe eleison. *Priest*: Kyrie eleison. Christe audi nos. *People*: Christe exaudi nos?

This seems the correct way, according to all the books we read, and yet is hardly ever recited thus.

2°. In some churches it is customary for the priest to wear a stole while reciting the Rosary. Is this allowable, and if so, must the stole correspond to the Office of the day?

3°. Some rituals prescribe the use of surplice, stole, and cope at funerals, while others merely prescribe surplice and stole. In Fortescue's *Ceremonies of the Roman Rite* I read that 'the cope may be used to add greater solemnity.' This seems rather vague. For ordinary funerals (not immediately following Requiem Masses) is it not more proper to dispense with the cope?

4°. With reference to the decree published in the February number (p. 221) by which the privilege is granted to members of the 'Pia Unio' to anticipate Matins and Lauds at noon, provided they have finished the Office of the day, I should like to know if this involves the privilege of saying Vespers and Compline before noon without a reason, or if it means that the privilege avails only when one has said Vespers and Compline for a sufficient reason.

PERPLEXUS.

1°. It is, of course, the correct way of reciting the Litany, though—and it is, as our correspondent suggests, a matter for regret—it is not always sung or recited thus. The priest (or chanter) recites (or sings) the last 'Kyrie' and the 'Christe audi nos' without a break, and the people (or choir) respond 'Christe exaudi nos.' The latter two are a Versicle and Response, which occur in other parts of the Liturgy, and the Versicle is always the part of the priest. To get rid of a custom of this kind, either in a congregation or community, is not easy, but perseverance in calling attention to it will eventually have its reward.

2°. We have seen the stole used at the Rosary recited by the priest both before and during the Benediction Service. Sometimes the Blessed Sacrament is exposed before the Rosary as during October Devotions, and the cope is not assumed until just before the actual Benediction. The stole is allowed in such a case, for the whole function of Benediction and Rosary may be regarded as one liturgical act. For the Rosary alone we have not found any authority sanctioning the use of the stole,

nor do we think it should be used—it is neither a Sacrament nor a Sacramental. The colour used in connexion with Benediction is white, unless it follows immediately after Mass or Vespers, when the colour of the Office of the day may be used.

3°. Dr. Fortescue hits off the situation when he says ‘the cope may be used to add greater solemnity.’ The Roman Ritual allows a certain liberty in the matter. In its description of the opening ceremony of bringing the corpse to the church, it directs: ‘*Parochus indutus superpelliceo et stola nigra vel etiam pluviali ejusdem coloris,*’ etc., but in the remainder of the ceremony, viz., the Absolution and Procession to the grave (when near the church), as the celebrant is there accompanied by Assistants, it is presumed that he wears the cope. On such occasions, when the full ceremony of Solemn Mass and Absolution is gone through, it would be becoming to follow the Roman Ritual if a cope is available, but if it is not, or if custom or the prescription of the local Ritual is otherwise, there need be no scruple about wearing merely the black stole over the surplice. Whether it is more proper at ordinary funerals (not immediately following Requiem High Masses) to dispense with the cope or not, will depend upon the custom of the church and the prescriptions of the local Ritual. Such an act might very easily offend the relatives of the deceased, who may have supplied the usual facilities for the more solemn function. We have in mind only, of course, the Absolution in the church; the carrying of the cope to the graveside, more especially when separated a distance from the church, would be a decided inconvenience.

4°. We think the decree must be taken to involve the privilege in question, otherwise the concession would be next to useless for all practical purposes. To avail of the privilege at all it is prescribed that the Office of the day should have been said, and it is a fixed principle of the Canon Law that a faculty or privilege that necessitates the exercise of other faculties or privileges for the proper use of it must be taken to include them. Canon 66, § 3, reads: ‘*Concessa facultas secumfert alias quoque potestates quae ad illius usum sunt necessariae.*’ The wish, therefore, of a member of the ‘*Pia Unio*’ to avail of this privilege may, we think, be taken as a sufficient reason for saying the Vespers and Compline of the Office of the day, at least at such a time before noon as will leave him free to start the new Office on the stroke of twelve o’clock.

CONFESSION FOR THE FIRST FRIDAY. TRANSFERENCE OF STATIONS OF THE CROSS

REV. DEAR SIR,—Will you kindly clear up the following points for me in a coming number of the I. E. RECORD:—

1°. *Re* confession for gaining the Plenary Indulgence through Holy Communion on the morning of First Friday. As well as I can remember, one of the conditions for gaining the indulgence is to confess ‘the previous day’ (‘*qui pridie,*’ etc.). Now, it often

happens that it would be impossible to hear the confessions of the faithful on the day preceding the First Friday, for one reason or another. What I would like to know is, could a person going to confession two, three, or more days before, gain the Plenary Indulgence associated with the First Friday, provided he fulfils the other conditions.

2°. I intend to get a new set of Stations of the Cross for a parish church and to transfer the existing ones to an outside church, where the Stations are of an inferior kind: (a) Need the old Stations be again canonically erected and indulgenced, or is it sufficient to hang them up without further ceremony? (b) Granting that I get the requisite faculty from the Bishop to erect them, what form may I use? Would it be sufficient to detach the crosses and bless them? (c) Would it suffice to bless one cross out of the lot for all, or should all the Stations be first placed in position and then the blessing of each be proceeded with?

PAROCHUS.

1°. Our correspondent is mistaken in regard to the terms of the decree granting this indulgence. Neither the words 'qui pridie' nor any equivalent terms occur in it, as may be seen from a glance at the decree itself. The decree was granted by the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences on September 7, 1897, and reads as follows:—

'Gulielmus Pifferi, Epis. Porph. ad S.V. pedes parvolutus humillime exponit quod R.R. P.P. Plenariam Indulgentiam benigne concesserunt lucranda prima sexta cujusque mensis ab omnibus Christifidelibus qui Conf. SSmi. Cordis Jesu nomen dederunt. Ut magis magisque haece devotio augeatur S.V. humiliter exorat ut eandem Indulgentiam omnibus utriusque sexus Christifidelibus concedere dignetur qui dictae confraternitati adscripti non sint, tamen die supra dicta vere poenitentes, confessi ac S. Synaxi refectionis infinitam SSmi. Cordis Jesu caritatem pia meditatione recoluerint et aliquamdiu ad mentem S.V. oraverint, insuper ut ejusdem Christifidelibus qui praefata praestiterint quaecunque sexta anni feria indulgentiam septem annorum totidemque quadragenarum benigne elargiri dignetur:

'SS. D.N. Leo PP. XIII benigne annuit pro gratia in omnibus juxta preces. Presenti in perpetuum valituro absque ulla Brevis expeditione contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.'

From this we see that the conditions for gaining the Plenary Indulgence, which prescind altogether from membership of any sodality, are Confession, Communion, Meditation on the infinite charity of the Sacred Heart, and Prayers for the Pope's intention; and that the fulfilment of the same conditions on *any* Friday of the year will entitle the faithful in general to a *partial* indulgence of seven years and seven quarantines.

It is not prescribed, therefore, as a condition for gaining the Plenary Indulgence that confession should take place either on the First Friday or on the previous day, and we take it that the general regulation of the New Code applying to all such indulgences, viz., that the confession

may take place within eight days preceding the day to which the indulgence is attached (provided, of course, the state of the penitent's soul does not in the interval need confession), applies equally in this case. Canon 931, § 1, reads: 'Ad quaslibet indulgentias lucrandas confessio forte requisita peragi potest intra octo dies qui immediate praece-dunt diem cui indulgentia fuit affixa.'

2°. (a) Yes, the old Stations must be again canonically erected and a new faculty for their erection obtained from the Bishop. By their transference from one church to another they lose the indulgence.¹

(b) The form, with all necessary directions, is given in the Ritual. For the validity of the indulgence it would be quite sufficient to bless the crosses—to them the indulgence of the Way of the Cross is attached,—but it is customary also to bless the pictures, with the form of blessing given in the Ritual.

(c) All the crosses should be blessed, and it will not suffice to read the form over one. Where is the difficulty of blessing all the crosses together with the form of the Ritual, and then seeing that they are erected in their positions? For the imparting of the Indulgence it is not necessary that the priest who blesses should also erect the Stations, though he should be morally present when they are erected; nor is it necessary for the validity of the indulgence that the ceremony of erection given in the Ritual, e.g., the allocution, the meditation, and the exercise of the Way of the Cross, should be carried out, provided the crosses have been duly blessed. As far, however, as circumstances permit, the more laudable and proper course will be to carry out the ceremony in full accordance with the prescriptions of the Ritual.

M. EATON.

¹ Beringer, vol. i. 273-76

DOCUMENTS

PANEGYRIC ON THE LATE POPE BENEDICT XV DELIVERED ON THE LAST DAY OF THE OBSEQUIES BY THE MOST REV. D. PACIFICO MASSELLA

(February 1, 1922)

Die vero 1 februarii, novemdialium exsequiarum postrema, a Rñño D. Pacifico Massella, a secretis litteris latinis, conscripta, haec habita est

BENEDICTI FEL. REC. PP. XV LAUDATIO

Intuenti mihi in pontificatum Benedicti XV, parentis desideratissimi, ac memoria repetenti quam multa utilia provisa ab eo Ecclesiae sint, quam brevi temporis spatio, quot inter curas ac sollicitudines turbulentissimae tempestatis, illa sponte occurrit sententia *consummatus in brevi, explevit tempora multa*.¹ Etenim non tam diuturnitas temporis metitur vitam, quam recte factorum gloria; iique diu vixisse dicendi sunt, qui operum multitudine iter confecerint multorum annorum.

Dictum vulgo est, nunc occasione obitus et alias saepe, Benedictum fuisse pontificem caritatis et hoc esse veluti insigne quoddam pontificatus illius. Vere id quidem honorificeque admodum; mihi que concedite, Principes eminentissimi, ut Benedicti laudes in hoc amplissimo concessu, mandatu vestro praedicaturus, caetera pene praetermittens virtutum ornamenta, aliquid breviter attingam de multiplici illius caritate. Hac enim maxime virtute videntur homines proprius ad Deum accedere; et hac eadem de caussa, digna mihi illa praeter ceteras videtur, quam in Romano Pontifice commemorem.

Tueri christianum nomen, eidemque latius in dies proferendo dare operam: eniti ut religio splendore praeccellat suo, fiatque in omnibus fons aquae salientis in vitam aeternam, hae sunt laudes ad quas pontifex quem amissum dolemus, curas in primis cogitationesque contulit. Neque is profecto erat Benedictus, qui ad pontificia munera parem, quantum homini datum est, non afferret animi magnitudinem. Ad tenerram enim in Deum pietatem, quam materno cum lacte hauserat, et ad eas virtutes, quas pietas inserit et colit, accesserunt consilii prudentia, doctrinae copia, dicendi facultas, agendi sollertia et consentanei generis nobilitati mores. Cumulum auxit rerum plurimarum usus, tractandis diu in Romana Curia negotiis comparatus; nec sine divino quodam numine factum fuisse arbitror ut, qui regendae Ecclesiae universae destinaretur, pascendo dominico gregi aliquandiu vacaret. Hoc tantum virtutum comitatu, nihil mirum si, vixdum renuntiatus pontifex

maximus, Benedictus, quasi in possessionem suam veniret, ita ad Ecclesiae gubernacula accedere visus sit.

Perarduum est, eminentissimi Patres, in tanta apostolicae potestatis amplitudine, in tanta ubique terrarum multitudine catholicorum et varietate ac copia negotiorum, quae undique ad Apostolicam Sedem cotidie deferuntur, sequi in omnibus pontificem inexplebili quadam agendi semper aliquid ac moliendi voluntate praeditum. Vix enumerando recolam Codicem iuris canonici, Benedicti auctoritate promulgatum; praedicationem verbi Dei revocatam ad nativam dignitatem; studia sacrae Scripturae severioribus munita legibus; curas locatas in excolendis provehendisque sacris Missionibus; Romanam Curiam novis auctam consiliis; industriam multiplicem ut Orientis Ecclesiae ad fidei unitatem redeant; coepta denique plurima ut catholica religio vim suam salutarem, in publicae ac privatae vitae actionem late diffundat. Huc spectavit, ut pauca proferam ex multis, Tertius Franciscalium Ordo christifidelium universitati saepe commendatus; huc Dominici, Hieronymi, Ephrem aliorumque sanctorum virorum commemorata per opportunitatem exempla; huc socialis catholicorum actio temporibus aptius servire iussa; huc excitate Rosarii Marialis consuetudo; huc alendae fidei ac pietati provisa adiumenta plurima. Eminent, ut videtis, in his omnibus caritas boni pastoris qui, dum traditum sibi gregem nutrit ac fovet, simul oves quaerit, quas flebilium casuum vis ab ovili seiunxit, simul eas persequitur, quas nemo adhuc ad ovile compulit.

Atque ego non tam velim consideretis multiformem hanc Benedicti caritatem, diligentiamque qua negotiis, quae in Romana Curia agebantur, aderat omnibus, consiliique lumen quod ad omnia afferebat, quam quae nactus sit tempora ad providendum maxime difficilia. Vidimus ardentem diu immani bello Europam: vidimus Austriam, Hungariam, Germaniam, Galliam, Russiam, Britanniam, Belgicam, Italiam finitimasque gentes fere omnes, quasi esset in exitio salus, aliam ex alia in eandem se conicere flammam: vidimus sacrorum administros arma sumere et castra sequi iussos; paroecias bene multas viduatas pastoribus; sacra Seminaria ac religiosorum virorum domos versa in solitudinem; plena denique omnia luctus, plena omnia curarum. Per spatium quadriennio maius, acriter ex utraque parte bellatum est. Non ius gentium, non data fides, non sacrorum maiestas militum manus a vastatione, a caede cohibuerunt. Quo quisque erat fortior, eo erat crudelior. Quantae, ex unoquoque capite, congestae in unum hominem sollicitudinum caussae! quot incommoda apostolico circumfusa ministerio! Sed num aquae multae poterunt exstinguere caritatem? Fortior illis omnibus et ad excogitandum alacrior effectus et ad agendum, Benedictus clerum ac populum, fidem ac mores, Orientem atque Occidentem apostolica providentia complexus est, et caritatis suae vim ad omnes Ecclesiae vitae partes, ad omnesque necessitates protulit.

Addite studium ab eo collatum in coniungendis, redintegrandis amicitiiis cum Civitatibus plurimis. In quo, nova sapienter usus temporum condicione et ipsis temporibus caute serviens, tam felici cum exitu adlaboravit, ut nesciam an numquam antea Romanus Pontifex

se honestatum viderit tam multiplici Legatorum corona. Non infructuosum quemdam ornatum in ea sibi quaesivit Benedictus ; sed subsidium simul ad latius uberiusque iuvandam civitatem.

Evectus enim ad Petri Cathedram cum bellum internecinum fere totam miscebat ac vastabat Europam, statim intellexit pontificiae caritati hoc duplex parari munus : maturandi pacem et allevandi belli calamitates ; neque eidem aggrediendo moram attulit.

Magnam rem et multis difficultatibus impeditam aggrediebatur. Quae enim bellum excitarant, similitates et odia civitatum inter se, opes augendi finesque proferendi effrenatae cupidines, eadem oberant quibuslibet pacis coeptis. Sed non is erat Benedictus, quem aspera terrent vel ardua exanimarent. Pontificatu vix inito, tametsi undique conclamabatur ad arma, et ruinarum ac caedium consilia ac proposita tenebant omnes, pacem, magnum illud christianae fraternitatis bonum, pacem, omnium altricem bonorum, commendare, suadere instituit.

Fuit qui coeptum hoc et etiam propositum abstinendi ab omni studio partium, non satis probaret, perinde ac proderent nimis timidum amorem iustitiae, hominem qui in tranquillo tempestatem adversam timeret. Non his profecto assentietur qui, vacuo a praeiudicatis opinionibus animo, consideraverit Romani Pontificatus officia ac munera, idemque tempora et verba recoluerit ac facta Benedicti non pauca. In tanto enimvero armorum ardore atque animorum, quantum ipsi vidimus et horruimus, administer Illius qui *pacis princeps* vocari voluit, quas sibi Benedictus eligeret partes, nisi patris qui plorans se proripit inter digladiantes filios ? Num ageret partes iudicis, rebus non satis exploratis, idque in eos, quos caritas filiorum loco esse iubebat ? Patrocinio iustitiae nonne satis, ut potuit, consuluit cum toties ad pacem hortatus est quae foret iustitiae opus ac iustis populorum votis faceret satis ; cum iuris sanctitatem fortibus ac debilibus, summis atque imis adseruit ; cum a Belgica, ab Armenia, a Polonia iram compescuit atque aviditatem victoris ; cum denique, quae graviora crimina satis emerserunt, ea palam improbavit ? Non eos profecto audiit Benedictus quorum *os maledictione plenum est et amaritudine et dolo*,¹ sed unam officii conscientiam ; a qua nec spes nec metus, nec laudes nec criminationes iustum ac tenacem propositi virum umquam dimoverunt. Non omnia praeterea vulgata hac de re sunt : multa tabulariis sunt consignata principum, quae cum proferentur, nimium quantum Benedicti sapientiam, iustitiam, constantiam, caritatem illustrabunt.

Protrahitur interea, ancipiti fortuna, bellum in menses et annos : nulla iam vacant calamitate civitates : pacem sitiunt omnes. Et eo res sunt deductae, ut, omnium sententia, omnis conciliandae pacis spes sit in Romano Pontifice ; eumque adire undique plurimi, rogare, obtestari ut quidquid esset in apostolica auctoritate momenti, impenderet in componenda pace. Haud moratur Benedictus suae caritatis officia, et ad moderatores civitatum, quae diversae pugnabant, Roma profecta iterum vox est pontificis hortantis graviter ad pacem et pacis

¹ Prov. x. 3.

conficiendae quaedam innuentis quasi fundamenta. Quid caussae fuerit cur etiam hortamenta haec inaudita conciderint, iam arcanum non est. Clandestinum foedus, matribus detestatum, Europae non uno nomine poenitendum, irritum decreverat infectumque quidquid de pace concilianda Romanus Pontifex utcumque aggressurus esset. Novimus unde res habuerit zizania : vidimus quid is attulerit qui, novus pacis sequester, in alienam messem intulit falcem. Sunt ea pacis consilia ac foedera, quorum altera ad dividendam praedam, altera ad bellum continuandum inita non immerito visa sunt. Re quidem vera, nec pacati sunt animi civium, nec sincera amicitia iunctae civitates : pullulant ubique intestinae discordiae, et quae politicae oeconomicaeque disceptationes iam dudum consilia exercent principum, eae nec tolerabiliora praesentia efficiunt, nec minus formidulosa futura. Sane quam apte cadit in haec Davidicum illud : *qui elongant se a te, peribunt*.¹ Non ego illatae in Romanum Pontificem iniuriae magnitudinem ; non moerorem catholicorum omnium ; non damna commemorabo, quae Europae omni retardata pax imposuit. Unum non silebo, temperantiam ac mansuetudinem Benedicti, qui, iniuriae immemor, pacem conciliandam firmandamque omni, quo potuit, apostolici ministerio officio iuvare haud destitit, et afflictis bello populis pontificiae caritatis thesauros aperuit.

Quem postremam celebraturus laudem, Patres amplissimi, rem attingo in qua exultat ac triumphat oratio mea. Non cotidianam stipem indigentibus submissam ; non liberalitatem in publicis calamitatibus ; non hospitales domos aegrotis, pueris recipiendis ; non subsidia commemorabo a Benedicto largita ad varios pios usus plurima. Praeclara haec quidem consuetudo beneficentiae, sed communis cum Decessoribus : illa Benedicti propria et omnium gentium omniumque saeculorum praedicatione celebranda, cui exercendae patentissimum campum bellum aperuit. Cui enim tunc civium ordini, vel cui generi miseriarum Pontificis providentissimi caritas non liberalissime occurrit ? Claro et obscuro loco natis ; divitibus ac pauperibus ; catholicis atque iis qui dissident, nullo facto inter eos religionis vel gentis discrimine, Vaticanae aedes tunc maxime patuere. Testes vos appello, captivi milites ; vos undique huc cotidie confluentes, turbae virorum ac mulierum, de infirma valetudine vel de incerta earum vestrorum sorte sollicitae ; vos, falanges deportatorum ; vos, pueri puellulaeque, *grex immolatorum tener*, fame, frigore prope perimendi ; vos, inermes cives, exsilio, vinculis, capite, heu miseri ! damnati ; vos denique, matres, vos, viduae, quarum natis ac viris contigit, alieno sub caelo, in bello oppetere. Salubriorem spirare aerem in patriamque reverti ; mittendis accipiendisque nuntiis confirmare animum, lenire dolorem ; in libertatem vindicari anxiusque restitui parentibus ; teneram sustentare tueri vitam ; a carcere, a certa morte liberari ; condere sepulcro cara pignora ; custodire, inferre in patriam desideratos cineres, dum animae ubique terrarum sacris expiabantur, nonne providenti caritate Benedicti datum vobis est ? Nonne

¹ Ps. lxxii. 27.

quo tempore Europa fere omnis flagrabat odiis ac sanguine difflebat, visae vobis sunt aedes Vaticanae sedes ac domicilium esse christianae caritatis, et omnibus omnium levandis necessitatibus cor unum sufficere Romani Pontificis?

*Venient ad te qui detrahebant tibi, at adorabunt vestigia pedum tuorum.*¹ His me Isaiae verbis non semel tacite, in animo meo, Benedictum compellasse memini cum ea audirem, quae toto belli tempore congesta in eum per invidiam sunt, et hanc perspicerem pene infinitam vim beneficiorum, quae paucis commemoravi. Nescio quomodo, inhaerebat in mente quasi quoddam augurium futurorum temporum. Vix dum enimvero ab armis cessatum est ac remisit animorum aestus, statim consilia ac coepta Benedicti non querelae, sed admiratio consecuta est; eaque tanta, ut Benedicti nomine rebusque ab eo gestis vel ipsae personarint legumlatorum aulae, eidemque, quasi inito amoris obsequiique certamine, tributae undique laudes, decreti honores, erecta signa.

At vero non haec tibi, Benedicte, quaesita sunt virtutis praemia, non haec monumenta gloriae. Maior et ad maiora natus, maiora spectasti. Civis nunc, ut confidimus, Sanctorum ac domesticus Dei effectus, fruire aeternis iis bonis quae tua tibi pietate, quae laboribus, quae vigiliis, quae tuenda iustitia, quae exercenda liberalitate, quae suscipiendis invidiis, quae tolerandis iniuriis parta olim sunt. Nos quidem et virtutum et beneficiorum tuorum perpetuo recordabimur; tu vero ne obliviscaris nos, et qui e vita iam iam cessurus pacem populis a Deo precatus es, nunc validiore precum subsidio, perge hoc iisdem implorare, ut, redintegrata christiana fraternitate, sedere tandem aliquando liceat *in pulchritudine pacis*.

A PERPETUAL FACULTY OF RULING AND ADMINISTERING SEMINARIES IS GRANTED TO THE SOCIETY OF PRIESTS OF SAN' SULPICE

(December 23, 1921)

FACULTAS PERPETUA REGENDI ET ADMINISTRANDI SEMINARIA CONCEDITUR SOCIETATI PRESBYTERORUM A SANCTO SULPITIO

BENEDICTUS PP. XV

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.—Antiquius nihil, nihil magis Nobis cordi est, quam ut in sortem Domini vocati iuvenes pie recteque instituantur. Iamvero constat et amplissimis probatum est suffragiis, Societatem Presbyterorum a Sancto Sulpitio nuncupatam, conspicuis in Ecclesiam meritis praestantem, ad id instituto suo intendere, videlicet ut iuvenum clericorum mentes sacris scientiis atque ecclesiasticis disciplinis imbuantur in Seminariis, eorumque animi ad pietatis studia informantur. Exploratum quidem habemus ex unanimi Sacrorum

¹ Isaiax lx. 14.

Antistitum testimonio, Societatem eamdem frugiferum ad propositum sibi finem assequendum summa diligentia conniti. Placet igitur Nobis memoratae Societatis coeptis favere, atque, hoc ducti consilio, audito suffragio VV. FF. NN. S. R. E. Cardinalium Congregationi de Religiosis praepositorum, haec quae infra scripta sunt largimur atque statuimus. Nimirum, Apostolica Nostra auctoritate, praesentium vi perpetuumque in modum concedimus, ut Societas Presbyterorum a Sancto Sulpitio, quin Sanctam hanc Sedem ad impetrandam in singulis casibus veniam adeat, sacrorum Seminariorum regimen sibi ab Ordinariis locorum conceditum accipere, eademque Seminaria sine Deputatorum interventu a sacris canonibus requisito, tam in spiritualibus quam in temporalibus, administrare libere ac licite possit et valeat. Hanc autem legem adamussim edicimus servari, ut, cum Superior generalis tum Sodales a respectivo Ordinario loci in omnibus dependeant, eidemque Ordinario, adstantibus duobus ex ordine canonicorum ecclesiae cathedralis ipsius dioecesis, quotannis reddituum rationem sub anni exitum reddere teneantur.

Haec mandamus, decernentes praesentes Litteras Nostras firmas, validas et efficaces semper exstare ac permanere, suosque plenos atque integros effectus sortiri atque obtinere, illisque ad quos pertinent, sive pertinere poterunt, nunc et in posterum plenissime suffragari, sicque rite iudicandum esse ac definiendum, irritumque ex nunc et inane fieri, si quidquam secus super his, a quovis, auctoritate qualibet, scienter sive ignoranter attentari contigerit. Non obstantibus apostolicis constitutionibus atque ordinationibus nec non, speciali licet atque individua mentione ac derogatione dignis, contrariis quibuslibet.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum, sub annulo Piscatoris, die XXIII mensis decembris MCMXXI, Pontificatus Nostri anno octavo.

P. CARD. GASPARRI, *a Secretis Status*.

PRESUMPTION OF DEATH IN A MATRIMONIAL CASE

(November 18, 1920)

[The decision was published in the *Acta* of February, 1922.]

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE DISCIPLINA SACRAMENTORUM

PRAESUMPTAE MORTIS CONTIGUIS

18 *novembris*, 1920

Ordinarius Z., in Hispania, supplici porrecto libello, Sacrae huic Congregationi casum exposuit praesumptae mortis cuiusdam A. A. V., transmisitque processum ad hunc finem confectum, expetens an uxori viri qui mortuus asseritur, alias inire nuptias permitti possit.

Omnibus perpensis, Sacra haec Congregatio rescripsit: 'Ordinarius canonicas inquisitiones complere velit ad normam instructionis S. C. S. Officii a. 1868, *Matrimonii vinculo*. Si peractis enunciatis inquisitionibus, iudicium sibi efformare non valeat, quo transitus ad alias

nuptias permittere queat, tunc omnia acta ad hanc S. Congregationem mittat.'

Ast idem Ordinarius respondit nihil amplius addi posse; deficere vero argumenta directa quae viri mortem demonstrent; sed, omnibus inspectis, fortasse non deficere indicia, ex quibus iure coniugis obitus erui possit. Nihilominus cum res incerta sibi videretur, iudicio Sacrae Congregationis eam libenter submitit.

In peracto processu habetur iuratum examen uxoris oratricis ac novem testium ad rem excussorum, et adduntur nonnulla exhibita documenta, praesertim quaedam epistola ab asserto defuncto scripta ad uxorem.

Porro, ut desumitur ex concordibus depositionibus fide dignis, A. A. V., agricola ex oppido P., dioecesis Z., circa exitum anni 1902 vel ineunte anno 1903, annuente uxore, negotiationis causa in Americam meridionalem se contulit, cum triginta annorum aetate esset et bona valetudine frueretur. Ac duos fere annos ipse transegit in urbe *Rosario de Santa Fé*, in Republica Argentina, ut scienter deponit testis I. A., qui ibidem cum ipso erat.

Ex ea urbe assertus defunctus epistolas ad uxorem et coniunctos continuatis vicibus misit; quin etiam eidem uxori quamdam pecuniae summam, usque ad quingentas et quinquaginta hispanicas libellas, mittere curavit.

Sed repente, ex mense decembri anni 1905, nullam amplius de se notitiam praebuit; neque quidquam de ipso ex eo tempore rescitum est.

Praefatus testis I. A., qui, ut supra dictum est, cum illo convixit, refert eum, eodem exeunte anno 1905, in longinquam regionem, ad caedendas arbores, perrexisse, sed ex tunc nihil amplius in ipsa America de eo sciri potuisse.

Praeterea pater et mater oratricis alique testes referunt matrem asserti defuncti vidisse olim epistolam a quodam eiusdem loci conscriptam, qui in Republica Argentina morabatur, suae familiae missam, in qua, inter alia, scribebat quemdam eiusdem loci non amplius fore rediturum ad fodendos lapides; quod habitum fuit velut nuncium mortis A. A. V.

Depositiones ipsorum parentum asserti defuncti non habentur; sed parochus ad iudicem retulit matrem ipsius in iudicium venire renuisse, cum nolit suam nurum novas inire nuptias; patrem vero cum quo locutus fuit, concordare cum iis quae testes retulerunt.

Insuper, uti testes unanimiter edicunt, assertus defunctus bonis moribus praeditus erat; religiose vivebat; uxorem, filiam ex ea genitam, parentes et coniunctos diligebat, prout etiam constat ex epistola, quam ipse die 17 decembris 1905 ad uxorem misit, quaeque tantummodo asserta est, et in actis profertur; ita nempe ut, si reapse non obierit, ipsius silentium deinceps explicari posse non videatur.

Nec defuerunt complures investigationes ad ipsum inveniendum institutae, sed semper in irritum cesserunt. Iam enim, pater ac mater oratricis, anno 1908, in ipsam Americam quoque profecti, inutiliter ibidem de genero exquisierunt; consanguinei ipsius A. A. V. frustra

interrogaverunt concives ex America redeuntes; atque instante syndico notalis oppiduli, qui etiam in processu deposuit, Consul hispanicus in urbe *Rosario de Santa Fé* annis 1918 ac 1920 frustra et ipse indagine peragere curavit, huiusque responsio in actis continetur.

Ex his circumstantiis fama de obitu A. A. V. a testibus asseritur, quin videatur in commodum eorum quorum interest, fuisse concitata; uxor autem alteri se coniunxit, putans suum virum demortuum esse, et spe ducta se quamprimum novas nuptias legitime esse inituram.

Iamvero EE. PP. in generalibus comitiis habitis die 18 novembris 1920, omnibus circumstantiis mature perpensis, ad dubium: 'An oratrici permitti possit transitus ad alias nuptias in casu,' responderunt: *Affirmative*.

✠ A. CAPOTOSTI, Ep. Thermen., *Secretarius*.

A WORK OF DR. NIVARD SCHLÖGL, OF THE ORDER OF CISTERCIANS, IS PUT ON THE INDEX OF PROHIBITED BOOKS

(January 16, 1922)

ACTA SS. CONGREGATIONUM

SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII

DECRETUM

DAMNATUR QUODDAM OPUS P. NIVARDI SCHLÖGL, ORDINIS CISTERCIENSII

Feria IV, die 16 novembris 1921

In generali concessu Supremæ Sacrae Congregationis S. Officii Eñi ac Rñi Domini Cardinales in rebus fidei et morum Inquisitores generales proscripserunt, damnaverunt atque in Indicem librorum prohibitorum inserendum mandarunt opus cui titulus: *Die heiligen Schriften des Neuen Bundes: Aus dem Urtext übersetzt mit Erläuterungen und einer Einführung*, von Dr Nivard Schlögl, Ord. Cist. o. ö. Professor an der Wiener Universität. Burgverlag Richter und Zollern, Wien, 1920.

Et insequenti feria V, die 17 eiusdem mensis et anni, Sanctissimus D. N. Benedictus divina Providentia Papa XV, in solita audientia R. P. D. Assessori S. Officii impertita, relatam sibi Eñorum Patrum resolutionem approbavit, confirmavit et publicandam mandavit.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus S. Officii, die 16 ianuarii 1922.

ALOISIUS CASTELLANO, *Supremæ S.C.S. Officii Notarius*.

REVIEWS AND NOTES

INSTITUTIONES THEOLOGIAE NATURALIS. Ad Usum Scholarum Accommodatae. Auctore G. J. Brosnan, S.J., Theologiae Naturalis Professor. In Collegio Maximo SS. Cordis Iesu Woodstockii In Marylandia. Chicago: Typographia Loyolaea, 1921.

THIS volume has had a good press. 'A glance at its contents,' one enthusiastic reviewer writes, 'prepossesses one straightway in its favour. The outlines, the orderly arrangement of the parts, the skilful adaptation of typography to arrest and sustain the student's attention, assist his memory, facilitate his analysis and synthesis—in a word, the whole didactic mechanism stamps the work as a model text-book, a splendid exhibition of pedagogy *in actu secundo*. Very many books have passed under the eyes of the present reviewer. They have never rested on a more perfect manual; one better arranged and printed. Indeed, one can almost envy the student who comes for work with so perfect an instrument. . . . There is one feature of the manual which the average student will rejoice to see so generously large. That is the employment of the English literature of Theism. . . . Father Brosnan quotes generously and wisely from English writers on his subject. He does this not only in illustration and confirmation of his own arguments and opinions, but also as embodiments of opposite views and as objections to the several theses. This collateral apparatus of English sources *pro* and *con* is an almost unique feature in a book of its kind.'

Most readers will assent to the praise given by this writer to the 'whole didactic mechanism' and the 'collateral apparatus of English sources' of Father Brosnan's treatise. They will assent, also, to the praise bestowed on the clarity and brevity of Father Brosnan's style. But there will be not, I fear, quite so general an agreement about 'the consecutiveness and thoroughness of the exposition.' The volume has three main divisions: the first dealing with the proofs of the existence of God, the second dealing with the essence and attributes of God, and the third with the action of God on creatures. Now, the crucial test of every treatise on Natural Theology is its treatment of the proofs of God's existence. Father Brosnan's first part deals in an extensive way with this topic: sixty pages are devoted to the exposition of arguments which seem to be put forward as particularly convincing; fourteen pages give a critical review of nine other arguments which are current in the Catholic Schools; and thirty pages are devoted to an account of the attitude of modern non-Catholics towards rational Theism.

The thirty pages of extracts from non-Catholic philosophers will convince students that Scholasticism is the main contemporary support

of the theory that reason can prove the existence of God. If we wish for certainty in this matter of the philosophy of Theism, we must, according to most non-Catholic theists, seek it in 'faith, instinct, the subconscious feeling, will, value-judgment, social sense, intuition, mystic reason, perhaps, *l'elan vital*. Most of these substitutes for reason, whilst differing in some minor points, have the common, fatal characteristic of being blind: all of them are spurious' (p. 102). This pitiful confusion among our theistic contemporaries is a striking confirmation of the argument in favour of Revelation urged in the *Summa contra Gentes* (Bk. I. c. iv.). St. Thomas argues that if the knowledge of the existence of God were left to the sole inquiry of reason, that existence would be known by a few, and by these after a long time and with admixture of error: only by a few owing to lack of brains or time or study; only after a long time owing to the stiffness of the arguments and the extent of their prerequisites; only with admixture of error owing to the perturbing force of imagination and to the infirmity of human judgment. The gist of St. Thomas's plea is, in fact, that no one but a well-trained metaphysician can grasp intelligently the proofs of rational Theism. 'The knowledge,' he says, 'of the truths that reason can investigate concerning God presupposes much previous knowledge. Indeed almost the entire study of philosophy is directed to the knowledge of God. Hence of all parts of philosophy, that part stands over to be learnt last which consists of metaphysics dealing with God.'

Father Brosnan's choice of fundamental arguments is, to me at least, surprising: he advocates the argument from produced being, that from design, and that from universal consent. The argument from produced being is not, despite Father Brosnan's hint, identical with St. Thomas's second proof: that argument may admit an infinite series; the second proof of the *Summa Theologica* insists on the impossibility of an infinite series. A more important point is a noticeable vacillation in the formulation of this argument by its defenders. Father Boedder, S.J.—one of our author's patrons—seems to admit that the Self-Existent proved by this argument may be material or spiritual, intramundane or supramundane: in consequence, he relies on supplementary considerations drawn from the nature and origin of the human soul to prove a personal supramundane Self-Existent. Father Brosnan, unless I am mistaken, follows the same line (p. 53). I suggest this procedure looks more like an abandonment than a strengthening of the argument from produced being. Nor is it clear that the supplementary argument carries you farther than its predecessor, unless proof be given of the origin at some moment of time of the human soul; and that proof is rendered exceedingly difficult by the foetal manner of existence of the human soul. . . . Father Brosnan's second argument is that from design. The issue, here, is whether secondary causes may not of themselves exist in some orderly arrangement. Father Brosnan excludes this possibility on the grounds that secondary causes do not of themselves postulate either existence or definite proportions or a definite collocation. They may not postulate existence, but that problem seems to belong to

the cosmological argument, and to it alone, unless a writer relegates the design argument from its usual independent position to a subsidiary proof drawn from the nature of creatures in favour of the intelligence of the Being that has been previously proved to their self-existent and self-active Source. But once secondary causes do exist, does not each of them possess its specific nature and a corresponding activity? and if so, does not the question of design turn on the question of primitive collocation? and this latter on the pre-existence or pre-determination of this primitive collocation? It is true, as the extract from Diman (p. 62) states, that evolution is a method which might be the path taken either by a voluntary cause or by a blind force. But when philosophy attempts to formulate an independent argument from design, and accepts, with St. Thomas and most of the Schoolmen, the possibility of the eternal existence of a finite world, it is not so obvious that evolution has nothing to say to the choice between a voluntary and an involuntary cause of the order of the universe. . . . Father Brosnan's exposition of the argument from the universal consent of mankind is very thorough. Many students will regret, however, that he gives no hint to the unwary of the strength, in this connexion, of the Catholic opposition. Cardinal Billot declares that this argument does not prove the existence of God, but the existence of arguments for the existence of God: two different things. Cardinal Mercier had apparently even greater misgivings about this argument: at best, it supplies, according to him, a presumption that valid proofs of some kind exist. Other Catholic authors dismiss this proof as worthless. All men do not believe in an infinite personal God: religions based on Nature-worship, Animal-worship, Ancestor-worship, Pantheism, have nothing to do with the theistic God; and according to Catholic statisticians, these religions comprise over seven hundred million worshippers—almost half the human race. Moreover, even if the whole human race did believe in an infinite personal God, the teaching of St. Thomas, already quoted, the facts of history, and the facts that come under our own observation prove that this belief would be based in the overwhelming majority of instances on tradition—parental, tutorial, tribal, national, racial, divine: hence, universal theistic belief can never possess that validity as a proof which Scholasticism attributes, in certain circumstances, to the universal convictions of the human race. These are but outlines of the weighty criticisms urged in Catholic text-books against this particular proof of God's existence. It is true that this proof has the support of a large number of distinguished authors. It is true, also, that each author has a right to his own opinion. But when a Catholic sets up as one of the three most valuable proofs for rational Theism an argument that is thought by many of his co-religionists and peers to be doubtful and even invalid, he surely owes his readers a statement of this difference of opinion between authors of repute.

Father Brosnan's review of the other nine arguments current among Catholics is good, as far as it goes. He cites authors for and against each argument, except where unanimity prevails. His defect here is due to the fact that he has not taken full advantage of the resources of

contemporary Scholasticism. Even when dealing with writers of his own Order, he appears to be loading the dice occasionally; for instance Father de Backer, who is cited as an authority on the argument from Duty, is either forgotten or ignored on the argument from Entropy. But an amazing feature of this review is the absence of even a single reference to the treatises of contemporary Dominicans. Those who have expended most thought on the defence of rational Theism can best realize the weakness entailed by this unaccountable eclecticism. The case against rational Theism is stated nowadays by a new learning of which St. Thomas and the medieval Schoolmen never dreamt. Regulars and seculars have taken part as neo-scholastics in the ever-recurring task of adapting the traditional proofs to the fresh points of view introduced by modern science and modern metaphysics. In these recent developments of scholastic Theism some of the best work has undoubtedly been done by the religious brethren of St. Thomas.

J. O'NEILL.

THE BOOK OF SAINTS. Compiled by the Benedictine Monks of Ramsgate. London: A. & C. Black.

The Book of Saints is a new 'Who's Who'—an alphabetical reference book to the saints canonized by the Church and mentioned in the Roman and other martyrologies. Only the briefest outline is given under each name, and that is just what is required in such a compilation. Still, in the cases of some of the best-known of modern saints, a little more detail about their life and works would be desirable. We must not, however, expect perfection all at once in a book that has entailed so much study and labour, though we express the hope that *The Book of Saints* will issue by issue be enlarged, as the original *Who's Who* has been enlarged, until it ultimately includes the numerous saints whose memory is religiously preserved in particular countries, but whose names are not recorded in any martyrology. An interesting Preface explains the ancient and the present system of canonization, and mentions some of the difficulties that beset the compilers in distinguishing the early saints. We cordially recommend *The Book of Saints* as a valuable addition to the list of modern reference books.

THE CATHOLIC EVIDENCE MOVEMENT: Its Achievements and its Hopes.

By Rev. Henry Browne, S.J. London: Burns, Oates, and Washbourne.

WE in Catholic Ireland cannot realize the need for Catholic propaganda in a Protestant country like England. Father James Hughes, of Liverpool, summed up the situation when he said that there were 34,000,000 fishes to be caught and only 3,400 fishermen, and concluded that nets must be used and not hooks. In other words, if the conversion of England is to be secured, the propaganda must reach whole multitudes rather than individuals. How reach these multitudes, since they will not approach a Catholic priest or enter a Catholic church?

By going after the lost sheep into the highways and byways. This idea it was that led to the foundation, in 1918, of the Catholic Evidence Guild, a body of laymen from whom a number of volunteers are selected and carefully trained as public speakers. Father Browne not only gives us the history of the Catholic Evidence Guild and of pioneer movements, but offers very practical advice to platform orators on the best methods of attack and defence, and on the question, 'which to prospective converts probably gives more trouble than any other,' the doctrine of exclusive salvation. In the final chapter the author prophesies the development of the Catholic Evidence Guild into a national society, with local committees and a central council. On this point, His Eminence Cardinal Bourne differs from Father Browne, and states in the Preface that, in his opinion, each Guild should be subject only to the Bishop of the diocese where the Guild is established.

Apart from the interest which every Catholic must take in reading this history of a movement so self-sacrificing and so earnest on behalf of those who are without the fold, the organization of the Guild and its methods merit attention, for even Catholic countries may in the not distant future require a Guild similarly constituted to counteract un-Catholic propaganda in our towns and cities.

ON MY KEEPING AND IN THEIRS. By Louis J. Walsh. Dublin: The Talbot Press.

FOR some eighteen months Mr. Walsh was 'on the run,' and he devotes the first few chapters of this small book to a description of his wanderings. Arrested in his own home towards the close of 1920, he ate his Christmas dinner in Derry Gaol, and was thence escorted, with due military honours, to receive the freedom of Ballykinlar! The remainder of the book is occupied with an account of the tears and the smiles that by turn glanced in the eyes of the inhabitants of this city of huts. Strikes are the order of the day in every city; so naturally the denizens of Ballykinlar had a strike too, with this difference, however, that all the denizens went on strike together! The whole episode is told in a couple of most amusing chapters. Imagine men on the run, raids, releases on parole, overtures, conferences, and peace terms—all within a ten-acre enclosure! In normal times classes in Irish and commercial subjects, as well as in vocal and instrumental music, were organized. Nor was the spiritual side forgotten. Mass was celebrated every morning; the Blessed Sacrament was regularly visited; in each hut the Rosary was recited at night; and most, if not all, of the huts were formally consecrated to the Sacred Heart.

Speaking of Dr. Hayes, who undertook the charge of the hospital, Mr. Walsh says that he must be thankful to Sir Hamar Greenwood for locking up Dr. Hayes in Ballykinlar. Readers of Mr. Walsh's little volume will add that they must be thankful to Sir Hamar for locking up Mr. Walsh at the same time.

REBUILDING A LOST FAITH. By an American Agnostic. London : Burns, Oates, and Washbourne.

IN the opening chapter the anonymous author gives us a brief sketch of his early life. He was born of Calvinistic parents, both of whom died before he was sixteen, leaving him 'a blessed memory of piety and love.' With the intention of becoming a minister he entered a theological university; but doubts, insoluble by his professors, led him to leave the university, and soon he drifted to agnosticism. The first awakening came amidst the unspeakable horrors of the World War, which roused him 'like the trump of God.' 'Life is a teacher, but death a still greater one.' The perishing thousands brought him face to face with the problems of God and immortality, and the words of Emmanuel Kant began to echo in his thoughts: 'Two things overwhelm me with awe, the starry heavens and man's accountability to God.' Before long those considerations bore fruit, and he humbly acknowledged the existence of God and the immortality of the soul. Bent on the attainment of truth, and directed by grace, he advanced step by step and found peace at last in the bosom of the Catholic Church. 'The One Holy Apostolic Church has given me certainty for doubt, order for confusion, sunlight for darkness, and substance for shadow.'

The work is laden with arguments and facts regarding controverted points of Catholic doctrine. A chapter is given to the 'faith and morals' of Luther, and both are a thing of shreds and patches by the time that the author has finished the chapter. In three subsequent chapters he gives the result of his inquiries into the state of Protestantism in Germany, in America, and in England—inquiries that convinced him that neither in rationalized Lutheranism, nor in discordant Sectarianism, nor even in divided Anglicanism, could he find the Authority, Unity, and Catholicity which he desired. In the concluding chapters he gives the arguments which conquered his inherited prejudices to the doctrines of Papal Infallibility, Purgatory, Indulgences, and worship of the Blessed Virgin and the saints. 'Favoured are those,' he concludes, 'who, from their childhood up, are nurtured in the Catholic Church, and to whom all the comforts, aids, and Sacraments come no less freely than the air and sunshine. Yet I have sometimes wondered whether such favoured Catholics ever know the rapture of the homeless waif, to whom the splendours of his Father's house are suddenly revealed; the consolation of the mariner, whose storm-tossed vessel finally attains the sheltered port; the gratitude of the lonely wanderer, long lost in cold and darkness, who shares at last, however undeservedly, the warmth and light of God's great spiritual *Home*!'

THE LITTLE FLOWERS OF ST. FRANCIS. London: Burns, Oates, and Washbourne.

'IN this book are contained certain little Flowers, namely, miracles and devout examples of the glorious poor little one of Christ, St. Francis, and of some of his holy companions, to the praise of Jesus Christ. Amen.' This sentence not only explains the meaning of the title, but

gives us a foretaste of the simplicity of the whole style and matter. Many of the incidents narrated will, indeed, draw a broad smile from the reader, not an incredulous one, however, but an affectionate one, at the child-like nature of St. Francis and his followers—as, for example, when it is described how Brother Masseo instructed the youth, an angel in disguise, on the proper way of knocking: ‘Give three knocks, one after the other, with the pause between each; then wait till the brother has said a *Pater Noster*, and if in this space he does not come, knock again’! And how the man-eating wolf of Gubbio concluded a treaty of peace, by which he agreed to offend no more, on condition of being supported for the rest of his life, giving, in token of the compact, the right paw of fellowship to St. Francis! And how the Blessed Virgin brought three boxes of electuary to a sick brother! The whole series of ‘Little Flowers’ is, in fact, redolent of the charming innocence, unquestioning obedience, and simple faith of the poor man of Assisi and his first associates. No wonder this work is as popular to-day as it was when first written, five hundred years ago.

The present edition has been carefully revised, and the volume is well printed and strongly bound.

D.

BOOKS, ETC., RECEIVED.

America: A Catholic Review (February).

The Ecclesiastical Review (February). U.S.A.

The Rosary Magazine (February). Somerset, Ohio.

The Catholic World (February). New York.

The Austral Light (January). Melbourne.

The Ave Maria (February). Notre Dame, Indiana.

The Catholic Bulletin (February). Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.

The Irish Monthly (February). Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.

The Month (February). London: Longmans.

Études (February). Paris: 12 Rue Oudinot (VII^e).

Revue Pratique d'Apologétique (February). Paris: Beauchesne.

The Fortnightly Review (February). St. Louis, Mo.

The Lamp (February). Garrison, N.Y.

Revue des Jeunes (February). Paris: 3 Rue de Luynes.

SCRIPTURE NOTES

I—THE PARABLE OF THE UNJUST STEWARD

(LUKE XVI, 1-9)

BY REV. P. BOYLAN, M.A.

THE passage of St. Luke's Gospel containing the parable of the unjust steward and Our Lord's application of it to the disciples (ch. xvi. 1-9), has given, and still gives, so much trouble to exegetes and preachers, that a brief treatment of some points of the narrative which are not generally insisted on may be found useful. The whole passage runs thus:—

(1) He said to His disciples: There was a rich man who had a steward against whom was made to him the charge that he was wasting his property. (2) So he summoned him, and said to him: 'What is this I hear about you? Hand in a statement of your management, for you can no longer act as steward.' (3) Then the steward said to himself: 'What am I to do, seeing that my master is depriving me of the stewardship? I have not strength to plough; I am ashamed to beg. (4) Ah, I know what I will do, so that when I am dismissed from the stewardship, people will welcome me into their houses.' (5) He then summoned each one of his master's debtors, and said to the first: 'How much do you owe my master?' (6) 'A hundred barrels of oil,' he said. Then he said: 'Here, take your bond, sit down at once, and write Fifty.' (7) Then he said to another: 'How much do you owe?' He said: 'A hundred quarters of wheat.' He said to him: 'Here take your bond, and write Eighty.' (8) And the master praised the dishonest steward, because he had acted shrewdly. (For the children of this world are shrewder in their dealings with their own¹ than are the children of light.) (9) And I, too, say to you: Make friends for yourselves by means of unjust mammon, so that, when ye die, they may receive you into eternal abodes.

The story, or parable, clearly ends with verse 8—probably with 8a. The phrase contrasting the methods of the children of this world and those of the children of light (8b) is most easily, and most naturally, understood as a remark of the Evangelist, which ought to be treated as a

¹ *In generatione sua* ought to be (according to the Greek) *in generationem suam*, 'towards their own kind.'

parenthesis. Verse 9 is certainly the application of the point of the parable to His disciples by Our Lord. It is not the Lord, but the master of the steward who praises the latter for his shrewdness. (Throughout the story the master is called κύριος.) But even though Our Lord does not directly praise the action of the steward, He nevertheless seems to set it up somehow as a model to be imitated in the Christian life. Further, He actually recommends His disciples to acquire for themselves friends through a means which is apparently called unjust—‘unjust mammon.’ It seems, however, incredible that Jesus could have recommended in any way for imitation the actions of a thief, and still more incredible that He could have solemnly taught that eternal dwellings (that is, dwellings in heaven) might be obtained by the use of unjust means. A brief consideration of the real point of the parable, and of the exact meaning of ‘unjust mammon,’ will be found to remove all serious difficulty.

In the parable Our Lord relates a possible incident in the life of a Palestinian capitalist who has a large estate let out to tenants. This landowner employed a steward or manager to deal with the tenants on his property. The tenants were expected to pay a yearly tax, or rent, to the landlord in the form of a definite quantity of commodities produced on their farms (or otherwise procured). The steward is reported to his master for carelessness and inefficiency, and when he is summoned before the landowner, and informed that he must give up his position, and hand in all documents dealing with his management of the estate, he makes no attempt to deny the charges made against him. Before he gives up his office, however, and hands over the documents which are in his keeping, he makes clever, but dishonest, provision for a future in which he will be unable to live either by working or begging. He calls together the tenants *individually*, and proposes to them to write new forms of contract,¹

¹ That γράμμα may mean ‘bond’ or ‘contract’ is well established. Cf. Moulton, *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, p. 131.

according to which the amounts of their yearly payments will be greatly lowered. This, he believes, will secure him a welcome and a home in the future with the tenants. He is, apparently, confident that the tenants will agree at once to his proposals, that they will be, like himself, 'children of this world.' We are not told whether they actually did agree to the dishonest proposals, and no further information as to the fate of the steward is supplied. The narrative ends dramatically with that up to which it is intended to lead—the attitude of the master to the new disloyalty of his servant. Somehow—we are not told how—he learns the whole story of the steward's dealings with the tenants, and his comment is: The fellow is indeed a rogue, but he is a clever rogue, and he has made a shrewd use of his opportunities to find a way out of his difficulties.

The passage in verse 8*b*, 'The children of this world are shrewder in their dealings with their own than are the children of light,' cannot well be taken as a saying of Our Lord in this context, for His words in verse 9 are introduced as if they were His *first* comment on the parable: 'I, too, tell you, etc.' The words are, as has been already suggested, best taken as a remark of the Evangelist. They help to explain, on the one hand, the confident assumption of the steward that the tenants will accept his proposals, and they supply an explanation, on the other hand, of the cynical comment of the master.

The aim of the whole story is, obviously, to illustrate the prudence, or shrewdness, with which a worldly-minded and dishonest man makes use of the worldly goods at his disposal to rescue himself from an awkward position, and to secure himself for the future.

In verse 9 the lesson of the story is applied to the disciples, the children of light. They should be prudent and shrewd enough to use even the worldly means which they possess to make themselves, as far as possible, spiritually secure for all the future. As the steward sought to rescue himself by using the wealth entrusted to his keeping, so

should the children of light use the worldly goods entrusted to them to further their spiritual security. It is clearly taught that alms ought to be freely given to brother Christians, so that those who are helped by the alms may, by their prayers, make it easier for their benefactors to reach heaven. As the worldly are prudent in their dealings with each other, so should the children of light (Christians) take advantage of each other's help. Here again, as in the master's comment on his servant's dishonesty, one point only is insisted on—the prudence of making provision for our eternal welfare by all means at our disposal. For this great purpose we should use the help of our brethren at least as prudently as the steward did the help of the tenants.

But the difficulty remains that Our Lord says that we should secure the friends that will help us by means of 'unjust mammon.' The sense is not, of course, that we should make 'unjust mammon' a friend, but that we should use 'unjust mammon' to procure friends. The Greek original is quite clear here, and the somewhat ambiguous Douay version, 'Make unto you friends of the mammon of iniquity,' should not be allowed to lead us astray. It is not possible to suppose that Our Lord counsels His followers here to acquire friends among the poor by dishonest, or dishonourable, means. Mammon means wealth, property, riches in general. There is no doubt that the word is used in Aramaic, the Greek of the New Testament, and in modern Hebrew in this sense. In Matthew vi. 24, and in Luke xvi. 13, in the phrase, 'Ye cannot be slaves to God and mammon,' the word is used for wealth personified—'Money.' The root from which this word comes is the same as that from which is derived *Amen*, and mammon was, apparently, used in the sense of 'money' in order to suggest that earthly goods are something *entrusted* to the care of men, and not something belonging absolutely to men. It would thus fit in perfectly with the thought of the parable just narrated if Christ had said, 'Make use of mammon (the goods entrusted to you) for your spiritual advantage—to procure the help of the poor.' But Christ

does not say, 'Make use of mammon,' but, 'Make use of *unjust* mammon.' If mammon is wealth, unjust mammon ought to be wealth unjustly acquired. Yet how could the children of light be thought of as acquiring wealth unjustly and how could Jesus fail to direct that unjustly possessed wealth should be returned to its true owners?

The difficulty is really not so great as, at first sight, it seems to be. It is a well-known fact that the concepts 'truth,' 'right,' 'justice,' 'perfection' are not held well apart in Hebrew or Aramaic. The Hebrew mind was not concerned with truth in the speculative, so much as in the moral, sense. The true was, for the most part, the reliable, or what one had a right to hear. A glance at a Concordance will show that the Greek word *ἀληθινός*, 'true,' corresponds in the Septuagint to a great variety of Hebrew words, which express such shades of meaning as 'reliable,' 'steadfast,' 'upright,' 'perfect,' 'honest,' 'good,' etc. Similarly, it will be found that *ἀλήθεια*, 'truth,' is used in the Greek Old Testament as the equivalent of Hebrew words, meaning 'the reliable,' 'the stable,' 'the abiding,' 'the established,' 'the just,' 'fidelity,' etc. While then, in Greek, right, law, and truth are easily held apart, for the Hebrew mind they tend to coincide. Hence the opposites of these, injustice, lawlessness, deception, tend also to fade into each other in Hebrew thought. There thus arises at once the probability that 'unjust mammon' in our context ought really to be '*deceitful* mammon.' Wealth is essentially deceitful, since the possession of it is so insecure. If we translate 'deceitful,' rather than 'unjust,' Our Lord's counsel amounts to this simply, that Christians ought to use the wealth which has been entrusted to them—the wealth which is, by its very nature, unreliable and deceitful (not necessarily unjust)—to purchase the good will of the poor, and thus to secure their co-operation—the co-operation of their grateful prayers—in our task of gaining heaven. Even though the poor whom we help by our alms do not precede us in death, their prayers will help to prepare for us our everlasting homes. This use of our wealth to help the

poorer brethren is that sort of prudence of the children of light in their dealings with each other, which Our Lord will have us learn from the story of the steward.

That 'unjust' ought to be replaced by 'deceptive' in verse 9 is suggested immediately by Our Lord's words in the same chapter of St. Luke, verses 10-11: 'He who is faithful in a trifling matter, is faithful in a great matter. And he who is dishonest in a trifling matter, is dishonest in a great matter. If, then, ye are not faithful in regard to *deceptive* mammon, who will entrust to you the *true* (mammon) ?'

The contrast here between *ἀδίκος* ('unjust' or 'deceptive') and *ἀληθινός* ('true') shows that we should render here in the first clause of verse 11, *deceptive*, or *false* mammon, not 'unjust' mammon. But the 'deceptive mammon' of verse 11 is obviously the same as the mammon of verse 9. There is no difference for the Hebrew mind between 'mammon of deception' and 'deceptive mammon': the former is a Hebraism,¹ exactly equivalent to the latter.

Understanding the parable in the manner explained, and putting aside all temptation to regard it as an allegory, and to seek to identify the 'Master,' and the 'Steward,' and the 'Tenants,' the preacher can insist on the two clear lessons which are taught in the parable and in Our Lord's application of it. The first of these is the obligation of the Christian to work unceasingly, untiringly, and with full use of all his resources, for his salvation, to apply to that end at least as much steadiness of effort and unflinchingness of purpose as the children of this world show in pursuit of their worldly interests. The second is that the children of light ought to make a calculating and shrewd use of every means within their reach in order to make secure their spiritual future. This second lesson includes an instruction on the best use of 'mammon'—of entrusted

¹ The so-called 'attributive genitive' is not necessarily a Hebraism, but it is frequently used in the Greek O.T. to render the analogous Hebrew construction.

riches; an instruction which can be usefully reinforced from the parable in Luke xii. 13-21. It is important to note that Our Lord's words do not, in any way, denounce the possession of wealth, but only the folly of not using it prudently as something entrusted to the wealthy whereby they may gain the gratitude and the prayers of the poorer 'children of light.'

P. BOYLAN.

ETERNAL LIFE

By THE BISHOP OF SEBASTOPOLIS

VII

Vital spark of heavenly flame !
Quit, O ! quit this mortal frame !
Trembling, hoping, ling'ring, flying,
O ! the pain, the BLISS of dying !
Cease, fond nature, cease thy strife,
And let me languish into life !

Hark ! They whisper ; angels say,
Sister spirit, come away !
What is this absorbs me quite ?
Steals my senses, shuts my sight,
Drowns my spirit, draws my breath ?
Tell me, my soul, can this be death ?

POPE.

SOME good men are inclined to discourage the thought of heaven and its joys. They tell us that God should be served and loved for His own sake, and not for the sake of His rewards, and that we should all do our duty, because it is our duty, and altogether irrespective of consequences. In short, they would persuade us that it is *selfish* to attach importance to the rewards of our actions, and wholly unworthy of a generous soul.

Thus, for instance, Père Grou, S.J., writes : ' So long as we love God with some thought of our own advantage remaining—as long as we seek our own interest in His service—as long as we seek ourselves ever so little—as long as we strive after perfection for our own sakes, and for the spiritual good that it will bring us—in a word, as long as the human "I" enters into our intentions, so long will that intention be, I will not say criminal or even bad, but mixed up with imperfection and impurity.'¹ But

¹ Vide *Manual for Interior Souls*, p. 228.

whence arises this imperfection of motive here spoken of? Fortunately the late Bishop Hedley, O.S.B., supplies us with a ready answer. In his *Retreat* (p. 399), he writes: 'The imperfection of this motive arises, when we separate the thought of bliss from the thought of God.' But this, of course, should never be done! The Bishop then goes on to explain that 'the true view is that God's possession, and perfect bliss, are one and the same thing. . . . The thought of our future rewards is a useful thought and true, as far as it goes; but *to remove its imperfection*, we should accustom ourselves to reflect that God Himself is our reward.' Regarded from that point of view, which is the only really correct one, he strongly recommends the consideration of our future happiness, as an excellent motive. He writes: 'It is a useful thought and true. To aim at celestial happiness is to live for God and for God alone, and whilst the Christian in this life tramples *self* underfoot, in order to give himself wholly to his God, even in the bliss of the other world he will be absorbed in God, and will find his happiness in that very absorption. If this is selfishness (he exclaims) it is of the very essence of nature, and the most imperative command of grace.'¹

The Rev. J. P. de Caussade, S.J., writing to a certain nun, Sister Charlotte-Elizabeth Bourcier de Monthureux, in 1734, also says something very much to the purpose, so I will make no apology for quoting him:—

I much approve of the reply you made to the person, who told you that she did not love God with sufficient disinterestedness. This is a visible *illusion of the devil*, who, under pretext of I know not what self-love, wants to keep this soul back, and to retard its progress. Tell her that self-love (I allude to spiritual self-love, which, although not sinful, tarnishes the perfect purity of divine love), is only found in those souls, who make of the gifts of God, or of His rewards, a motive to love Him for their sakes. . . . To love God for Himself and because He is God, and in as much as He is our own God, our GREAT REWARD, our sovereign good, infinitely good to us, is the pure and practical love of the saints. FOR TO LOVE ONE'S SUPREME HAPPINESS, WHICH IS GOD HIMSELF, IS TO LOVE GOD ALONE. These two terms express the same

¹ *Retreat*, p. 400.

thing, and it is impossible to love God otherwise than as He is in Himself. Besides in Himself He is our supreme good, our last end, and our eternal happiness.

But someone will say: supposing that God were not our eternal happiness, ought we not to love Him just the same, for Himself? O! What a strange and pitiable supposition! It is as much as to say, If God were not God! Do not let us split hairs so much, but go on in a direct and simple manner, broad-mindedly, as St. Francis of Sales advises. Let us love God with simplicity and as well as we can, and He will raise and purify our love even more and more according to His own good pleasure.¹

Dr. Mozley also refers to this subject, in one of his 'University Sermons,' and though he is not a Catholic, his words are worth recording, as an appeal to common sense:—

We would ask of one who argues against the desire of heaven, as being a SELFISH motive—When you come to the *actual* in man, can you deny that there is something excellent and lofty in his pursuing the good of a distant and supernatural sphere, from which he is divided by a whole gulf of being? Can you help yourself recognizing a nobility in this reaching forward towards the happiness of an unseen world at the sacrifice of the present, even though it is his own happiness that he aims at? Is it not something which you cannot help morally admiring, though it is for himself that he wishes? And if so, is not your argument from *self* gone? (p. 66).

He further observes that 'the Christian hope of immortality cannot be an egotistic hope, because the affection does not centre upon an individual; it is in its very essence social; love enters into its very composition, and it looks forward to a communion of good as its very end and goal' (p. 70).

All spiritual writers readily admit that the hope of Heaven is a far higher and nobler motive than the fear of hell. All allow that the desire of reward, especially when the reward consists in the possession of God, is a better and a superior stimulus than the dread of punishment. If, then, the thought of the appalling torments prepared by God for those who offend Him is a useful, a salutary, and

¹ Vide *Abandonment to Divine Providence*, p. 370.

a good motive, and one strongly recommended by even the greatest saints, surely we need have no scruples in recommending the thought of the inconceivable delights which God has prepared for those who love Him. In many a startling passage in Holy Writ, we are commanded to dread the awful judgments of God. 'Fear them not that kill the body, and are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him, who can cast both soul and body into hell' (Matthew x. 28). In order to inspire this salutary fear into the hearts of his hearers, the prophet Isaias puts them these searching questions: 'Which of you can dwell with devouring fire? Which of you shall dwell with everlasting burnings?' (xxxiii. 14). Many—perhaps the great majority of men—are restrained and kept from sin, by the fear of hell. And saints and doctors of the Church and preachers and missionaries and retreat-givers and others are never weary of describing the torments of the damned, and the horrors of their surroundings. If, then, the thought of hell be encouraged, and made use of, and approved of, surely we need have no hesitation in making frequent use of the higher and far nobler thought of Heaven.

Did any lingering doubt remain lurking in our mind, the example of our Divine Lord Himself would instantly drive it away. He frequently cheered His hearers by reminding them of the glorious future in store for them. He evidently wishes His followers to think of Heaven, and to encourage themselves by such reflections, and to feel happy at the prospect before them. Else, indeed, why should He cry out: '*Be glad and rejoice, for your reward is very great in Heaven*'? (Matthew v. 12.) Why should He exhort them, saying: '*Rejoice in this that your names are written in Heaven*'? (Luke x. 20.) For, how can we continue to rejoice and to be glad, unless we continue to think of our good fortune, and of all the delights which our heavenly Father has in reserve for His children. Jesus Christ even urges us to exert ourselves and to make every effort to increase this reward still further. As, for instance, where He bids us to 'lay up to ourselves treasures in

Heaven, where neither rust nor moth doth consume, and where thieves do not break through, nor steal' (Matthew vi. 20). Surely, if God-incarnate *tells us to be glad and to rejoice* because of the bright Home above, into which He desires to welcome us one day, and if He even urges us to render it still more beautiful and glorious by our good works and our charity, we should try and do what He tells us, and love to occupy ourselves with the thought of His immense generosity and liberality and love.

This, at all events, seems to be the view which the Saints took of the matter, and they are our great models and most precious examples. Just consider, for instance, the glorious St. Paul, one of the greatest and most generous-hearted of the Saints. Did he not rejoice, as he was bidden, at the thought of Heaven? Who can listen, in imagination, to his words, and not feel his emotion of triumph and of exultation and joy, as he breaks forth: 'The time of my dissolution is at hand; I have fought a good fight; I have finished my course; I have kept the faith. As to the rest THERE IS LAID UP FOR ME A CROWN OF JUSTICE, WHICH THE LORD, THE JUST JUDGE, WILL TENDER TO ME IN THAT DAY' (2 Timothy iv. 7).

Or listen to holy David crying out in wonder and delight, 'O! How lovely are Thy tabernacles, O Lord of hosts, my soul longeth and fainteth for the courts of the Lord' (Psalm lxxxiii. 1). So again: 'As the hart panteth after the fountains of water, so my soul panteth after Thee, O God' (Psalm xli.). 'When shall I come and appear before the face of God?' The same longing and feeling of impatience is found in other saints. 'Ah, when shall I see death,' demands Blessed Leonard; 'when shall I see these bonds, which bind me to earth, broken? When will that happy moment come, when I shall behold my God?' When St. Paul of the Cross was lying sick, he cried out in great joy: 'My prison walls are falling, and the poor prisoner will soon fly away to the glorious liberty of the children of God.' St. Francis of Sales, in his last illness, we are told, felt a particular delight in repeating: 'My

heart and my flesh rejoice in the living God. When shall I appear before His face?' Blessed Colomba, in her last sickness, was heard to exclaim with much earnestness: 'O! Death! precious in the sight of God, come and delay no longer, since every delay is a torment to me. Come, my only comfort, for thou alone canst eternally unite me to my sweet Spouse.'

But we might fill the I. E. RECORD with similar instances. But *cui bono*? Let us rather listen to St. Francis of Sales, who tells us that

a heart burning with divine love, feeling that during its pilgrimage here below, it will never be able to glorify God or hear Him worthily praised by others, longs to burst the bonds which link it to the earth, and to soar to the regions where He is perfectly glorified. This continually increasing desire [continues the Saint] sometimes acquires so great an ascendancy over the soul, that it banishes every other wish, and inspires her with a mortal disgust for the things of earth; she then endures a languor and debility which leads her to the brink of the grave; and it sometimes happens that she actually expires, when God permits this desire to become extreme.¹

It is generally taught that Our Blessed Lady died in this manner.²

That the Church approves and even encourages this thirst and this longing for the delights of Heaven, is clearly shown by her universal practice. She teaches us to pray that we may secure these joys, and puts words of the greatest longing into our mouths. Not only in the 'Our Father' does she bid us ask a hundred times a day that God's glorious Kingdom may come, but in the Holy Mass, in the Divine Office, in her liturgical prayers, she seems never to be weary of urging us to aspire after the happiness and the joys of our Home above.

We are expected to turn our thoughts heavenwards *even before the Mass begins*, and while we are vesting. Both Bishop and priest, while putting on the amice, are

¹ See Pagani, *Science of the Saints*, vol. iii. p. 574.

² 'Saepe amor potest esse tam vehemens, ut sequatur mors, omni spiritu vitali, prae nimia cordis dilatatione, diffuente. Sic multi putant B. Virginem vi amoris mortuam.' Vide Lessius, *De Nominibus Dei*, p. 212.

instructed to say : ‘Dealba me Domine, et munda cor meum, ut in sanguine Agni delbatus, *gaudiis perfruar sempiternis.*’ While adjusting the maniple, the Bishop prays that he may so carry it, ‘*ut cum exultatione recipiam mercedem laboris,*’ and the priest, in like manner. So again, on taking the stole, both Bishop and priest end the prescribed prayer, with : ‘*quamvis indignus accedo ad tuum sacrum mysterium, merear tamen gaudium sempiternum.*’

This ‘*Gaudium sempiternum*’ is never lost sight of. So, during the course of the Mass, the celebrant humbly begs God to vouchsafe to grant him ‘*some part and fellowship with His holy apostles and martyrs ; with John, Stephen, Matthias, Barnabas,*’ and the rest, ‘*intra quorum nos consortium, non aestimator meriti, sed veniam quaesumus, largitor admitte.*’ A little later, while placing the particle into the chalice, he prays that ‘*Haec commixtio . . . fiat accipientibus in VITAM AETERNAM.*’

So, again, when reciting the Preface, in Masses for the Dead, he renders thanks to the ‘Almighty Father, everlasting God, through Christ our Lord, *in whom the hope of a blessed resurrection is shown to us, that they who are saddened by the certain necessity of dying be comforted by the promise of eternal life to come. For the life of Thy faithful, O Lord, is changed, not destroyed ; and when the home of this earthly life is dissolved, an everlasting dwelling in Heaven shall be gained. Wherefore, with Angels and Archangels, with the Thrones and Dominions, etc., we sing,*’ and so forth.

It is said that St. Teresa could hardly listen to the *Credo*, without falling into an ecstasy. Her soul was full, to overflowing, with the highest conceptions of the splendour and magnificence of the heavenly places, so that when she heard the words, ‘*cujus regni non erit finis—Whose Kingdom shall have no end,*’ she frequently fainted away.

Should the celebrant make use of the beautiful prayers after Mass, provided in most Missals, he will find himself again invited to implore God to grant him a place among the Saints and Angels of Heaven. The first is composed by St. Thomas, and ends as follows : ‘*Et precor Te, ut ad*

illud ineffabile convivium me peccatorem perducere digneris ; ubi Tu cum Filio Tuo, et Spiritu Sancto, Sanctis Tuis est lux vera, satietas plena, gaudium sempiternum, jucunditas consummata, et felicitas perfecta.' The next prayer is by another great saint, viz., St. Bonaventure. He, in like manner, is athirst for the crown, promised to all who have 'fought the good fight,' and implores God '*ut langueat et liquefiat anima mea solo semper amore et desiderio Tui, Te concupiscat, et deficiat in atria Tua, cupiat dissolvi, et esse Tecum,*' etc. Upon this follows the Rythmus of St. Thomas, 'Adoro Te latens Deitas,' which ends also with a great sigh for the heavenly country :—

Jesu, quem velatum nunc aspicio,
Oro fiat illud, quod tam sitio ;
Ut Te revelata cernens facie,
Visu sim beatus Tuæ gloriæ.

Amen.

Even the well-known prayer, beginning 'Anima Christi sanctifica me,' winds up in the same way : '*Jube me venire ad Te, ut cum Sanctis Tuis laudem Te in saecula saeculorum.*'

We have referred to the prayers which form a part of every Mass, but even the special prayers, which differ according to the season of the year and according to the particular saint commemorated, very frequently renew the same petition, and sometimes more than once during the same Mass. If, for example, we turn to the Mass for Thursday in Holy Week, we find the priest asking for 'everlasting bliss' and for 'everlasting joys' both in the Secret and again in the Post-Communion.

If we examine the prayers composed by the Church, in honour of her innumerable saints, and which we are obliged to say both in the Mass and in the Divine Office, we shall be surprised to note how often she directs our thoughts to our heavenly country. How many terminate in some such form as this : '*ejus meritis et intercessione concede ; ut juste et pie viventes in hoc saeculo, ad coelestem patriam pervenire mereamur*' (St. Titus), or, '*ipsius nobis intercessione concede, a peccati servitute solutis, in coelesti patria*

perpetua libertate gaudere ' (St. Peter Nolascus); or '*ut ad aeterna mereamur gaudia pervenire*' (St. Scholastica). So again: '*ut quod ipse praedicavit et docuit fideliter sectantes, aeternae claritatis gloriam consequamur*' (St. Kentigern); or '*fac nos quaesumus ita eum venerari in terris, ut cum eo regnare possimus in coelis*' (St. Ethelbert); or '*concede; ut eius auxilio et imitatione certantes in terris coronari cum ipso mereamur in coelis*' (St. Ignatius); or '*concede ut nos, per ejus vestigia gradientes, ad gaudia sempiterna pervenire mereamur*'; or again, '*concede propitius, ita nos eorum consociari fletibus, ut perfruamur et gaudiis*' (SS. VII Fundatorum Ord. Serv. B.V.M.).

Every time we recite Matins, we beg for a share in the joys of the future life, both before the Fourth Lesson and before the last. In the first case we ask that '*Christus perpetuae det nobis gaudia vitae*'; and, in the second place, that '*Ad societatem civium supernorum perducatur nos Rex Angelorum.*'

Nor is this all. We are sometimes actually instructed to ask the Saints to obtain for us from God a more vehement desire for His heavenly kingdom. Thus, for example, on the feast of St. Edmund (November 16), '*ad utrasque Vesp. et ad Laudes,*' the cantor sings: '*Nobis in hoc exsilio, Sancte Pater Edmunde,*' and the choir replies: '*COELESTIS PATRIAE AMOREM, quaesumus infunde.*'

These are but a few specimens of hundreds of similar petitions, all of which suggest a high appreciation and a fervent longing for the joys of Heaven and the society of the Saints and Angels. In this way the Church seems to wish to lift up our thoughts and to fill our hearts with eager desires after God and all that the possession of God really means. The world is dark and there is so much to sadden and to depress us, that she would lighten our darkness, and cheer us amid our sorrows, by directing our attention to that peace which surpasseth all understanding, to that joy which no words can express, and to that happiness which no mind can conceive, and which God has promised to those who serve and love Him.

As the labourer in the midst of his wearisome toil cheers himself up by thoughts of the wages awaiting him, and the rest and peace which will be his when his heavy task is done, so will the faithful servant of God wisely and rightly encourage and lighten the burden of life, by calling to mind the inconceivably rich promises and the undreamed of rewards which His Divine Master has promised him, when he has accomplished the task that He, in His providence, has given him to do.

Even St. Peter himself did not hesitate to enquire what recompense he was to receive for having left 'all things' to follow our Blessed Lord. 'Quid erit nobis?' And, what is yet more worthy of note, Our Lord did not tell him that, having done a noble act, he should rest content, and not concern himself about the reward. On the contrary, He answered: 'You, who have followed Me, . . . when the Son of man shall sit on the seat of His Majesty, you also shall sit on twelve seats, judging the twelve tribes of Israel,' thereby evidently wishing to encourage him. But He did more. He made a magnificent promise not only to the Apostles, but to all who in future ages should imitate the Apostles and leave their possessions to devote themselves to His service. '*Every one*, who hath left house or brethren or sisters or father or mother or wife or children or lands for My name's sake, shall receive a hundred-fold, and shall possess life everlasting' (Matthew xix. 29).

Was no attention to be paid to this promise? Was all thought of the recompense to be forgotten and set deliberately aside as unworthy of a true lover of Christ? Such a view is unthinkable. The splendid promise was made to stimulate and to encourage, and to draw many hearts to make the sacrifice. Since those divine words were spoken, they have rung in the ears of millions and stirred countless hearts, and have led thousands, yea hundreds of thousands, to join the ranks of the priesthood, and to enter upon the religious life. In plain truth the promise was set forth as a motive; it was offered as an inducement; it was intended as an argument addressed to (not selfish but) generous

and devoted minds ; and its effect, during all the long centuries of the Church's history, has been immense and quite marvellous. We are human ; and God, who knows the clay out of which we are formed, is well aware that we are strongly influenced by the prospect of rewards ; and every fervent Catholic is as ready to acknowledge that fact to-day, as holy David was thousands of years ago, when he exclaimed : '*I have inclined my heart to do Thy justifications for ever*, FOR THE SAKE OF THE REWARD' (Psalm cxviii. 112). When we consider that the very essence of this reward is nothing less than God Himself, we shall realize that to labour and to suffer and to spend ourselves for the sake of the reward, is really to labour and to suffer and to spend ourselves for the sake of God, Whom we love above all things, and Whom we desire to please, and with Whom we long most intensely to be united.

There is no doubt but that the Saints found strength and comfort in the thought of eternal happiness ; then why should not we ? In times of trial and danger they were sustained and buoyed up and rendered capable of enduring even the most appalling tortures, by fixing their gaze upon the splendour and the magnificence of the reward. The Saints and Martyrs, especially in the first ages of the Church, embraced all kinds of trials and torments, not only with patience and resignation to the will of God, but also with transports of joy, because they were convinced that what they suffered bore no proportion to the incomprehensible joys reserved in Heaven for the faithful servants of God ; according to the words of the Apostle : '*The sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that is to be revealed hereafter*, for a moment of light tribulation *worketh for us, above measure exceedingly, an eternal weight of glory*' (2 Corinthians iv. 17). To object to the thought of Heaven, as encouraging selfishness, and as indicating a want of true love of God, is surely to go too far. It would not only look like criticizing Our Lord, Who distinctly bids us '*rejoice and be glad*,' but it would deprive us of one of the most powerful motives we have

for serving Him. As Pagani very truly observes : ‘ The hope of receiving so ample a recompense sweetened all the sufferings and afflictions of the holy martyrs, and bathed their souls in a torrent of delights, even whilst their bodies streamed with blood, and smarted under stripes that were inflicted by their cruel tormentors ’ (p. 221). Indeed, the thought of this recompense is an excellent one, and recommended by no less an authority than St. Paul, who, writing to the Corinthians, says : ‘ *Every one that striveth for the mastery refraineth himself from all things ; and they indeed that they may receive a corruptible crown ; but we an INCORRUPTIBLE ONE* (ix. 25

The great Apostle evidently approves of this motive, and encourages it, by his apostolic authority. When, indeed, we consider how many there are ready to strive and to deny themselves, and to lead laborious lives, for the sake of the very poor and unsatisfying prizes of this world, we can well understand what a strong and powerful incentive an eternal and an incorruptible crown in Heaven must be.

We have an excellent illustration of this in the case of a certain Fra Domenico, a famous hermit, whose wonderful career is referred to in *The Life of St. Catherine de Ricci* :—

Domenico, we are told by Sandrini, was a simple and unlearned man, but with such an upright soul that he made immense progress in the science of prayer and the love of God, and gained large profit from paying yearly visits to St. Catherine, whom he called his mother. One year Catherine had given him as a particular practice, never to lose sight of Heaven, and of the joy and glory that he hoped for there, as his reward. The holy man took his staff and wallet, and started afresh on his peregrinations from town to town, and shrine to shrine ; and at every step he took, at every alms he asked, and at every prayer he said, in all his annoyances and all his penances, he thought, as he had been told, of Heaven, with its joys and glories ; and behold ! this sweet thought lessened his burdens, scattered his cares, and soothed his weariness. Then, comparing the little that he did for God with the great things that God was preparing for him, he blushed to be such a cowardly servant, and so niggardly of his services to such a great and munificent Lord. Thereupon, he redoubled his prayers, fasts, penances, and good works, and patience under trial ; in short, his fervour in everything. But do as he would, the vision of Heaven constantly grew before his mind’s eye, bringing with it a *perfect torrent of inward joy*, so that, as he increased

his labours, he did but increase his happiness, and there were times when he even fell by the way, as he journeyed, actually overcome by the greatness of his delight. Had any one, at such moments, met the poor begging hermit, covered with sweat and dust, and gasping for breath, beneath some tree or hedge, he must have been filled with pity for his apparently wretched state of want and fatigue. Yet, this man was *just then happier than a king on his throne*, inwardly revelling in joys unknown to the ordinary mortal. When the year had run out, the disciple went back to St. Catherine for a fresh lesson. She suggested no new practice, but recommended him to keep always to the same, no other having been so sweet and fruitful. . . . It used to be said, in the Convent, that when this holy mother (Catherine) and son discoursed of the future life and its mysteries, wonderful things passed between them. . . . They are said to have been rapt sometimes, when together, into extraordinary ecstasies.¹

Would it not be well for us to follow the splendid example of this simple hermit? Should we not be far happier, as well as far holier, if we kept the thought of God's supernatural gifts before our minds, and adopted the method of Fra Domenico, so highly recommended by such a glorious saint as St. Catherine and so successful in its results? Look around upon the world to-day. On every side we see immense numbers of ambitious men and women, labouring and toiling and enduring every sort of hardship, privation, and fatigue, in order to gain some purely earthly and temporal end, upon which they have set their hearts. Surely, we ought to be prepared to do as much, and indeed infinitely more, for the sake of what is not only heavenly but everlasting.

There can be no doubt but that we do not make sufficient use of 'the glory to come' as a motive. Though many beautiful works have been composed and published to help us in our struggles after holiness and perfection, yet how very few lay any great stress on this motive, which is one of the most attractive of all. Take, for instance, such an admirable and at the same time such a very practical and well-known book as *Meditations on the Principal Truths of Religion*, by the Most Rev. Dr. Kirby, Archbishop of Ephesus, a favourite book with many of the clergy. There

¹ Vide *St. Catherine de Ricci*, by F. M. Capes, pp. 224, 225.

is scarcely a word about Heaven and its entrancing joys in any one of its pages. Yet there are no less than four entire meditations on hell and its torments, occupying some 50 or 60 full pages. Surely Heaven is quite as much 'one of the *principal Truths of Religion*' as hell, yet it is set aside and passed over. The same observations may be made in regard to many other books, which are put into the hands of both clergy and lay-folk. Little or nothing is made of the 'Crown of Eternal Glory' awaiting the faithful soul, so soon as his course has run. What is the consequence? The consequence is that while the man of the world is all on fire in his anxiety to win his *corruptible crown*, the zealous man of God scarcely troubles himself to think at all of the *incorruptible crown that is offered him by God*.

✠ JOHN S. VAUGHAN.

[To be concluded.]

HUGH ROE O DONNELL'S SISTERS

BY REV. PAUL WALSH, M.A.

IN the September number of the I. E. RECORD of the year 1920 Mrs. H. Concannon gives a sketch of the adventures of two famous ladies, sisters of Red Hugh O'Donnell, the last inaugurated chieftain of Tirconnell. The article is based in the main on O'Clery's *Life of Hugh Roe*, on Father C. P. Meehan's works, and on Tadhg O'Cianain's account of the Flight of the Earls. The last-mentioned work was edited by me some years ago, and I therefore took a particular interest in reading Mrs. Concannon's paper. There are, however, some points in regard to which I cannot agree with her. I think I can supplement or correct her statements in a few places, and perhaps the Editor will find space for some notes, collected at various times, bearing on the personages dealt with in the article referred to.

The two ladies who are the subject of Mrs. Concannon's sketch are Siobhán (or Joan) and Nuala, daughters of Hugh, son of Manus O'Donnell. This Hugh was chief of Tirconnell, and was married to the celebrated Inghéan Dubh, daughter of James Macdonnell of Cantire and Antrim, not later than 1569.¹ The four sons of this marriage are known on indisputable authority²: they were Aodh Ruadh, Rudhraighe,³ Maghnus, and Cathbharr. It is assumed by

¹ Hill, *The Macdonnells of Antrim*, 151.

² O'Clery, *Life of Hugh Roe*, 2.

³ Readers who are unacquainted with Irish documents will probably see no difference between this name and Mrs. Concannon's *Ruairi* (sometimes *Ruari*). The latter forms have no place in traditional Irish orthography. They might represent 'Ruaidhri,' a name which some people (including myself) have attributed to Aodh Ruadh's brother. But *Rudhraighe* (an immaterial variant is *Rughraighe*), anglicized by O'Donovan 'Rury,' is the correct form. *Ruaidhri* is a much less ancient name, and is Englished 'Rory' and 'Roderick.'

Mrs. Concannon that Siobhán, who became Hugh O'Neill's wife, was a *full* sister of these four men. She says, further, 'Siobhán was probably the eldest of the family, and must have been born not later than 1569' (p. 218, note). The fact is, this lady was only a *half*-sister of Hugh Roe and the others. On June 14, 1574, the Earl of Essex announced to the Queen's ministers in London the 'marriage between the Baron [of Dungannon] and O'Donnell's daughter.'¹ This daughter is admittedly Siobhán. As it is not likely that the Baron of Dungannon, Hugh O'Neill, married a girl of five years of age, or less, it is to be concluded that Siobhán, O'Neill's bride, was not a full sister of Hugh Roe and his brothers. Whoever may have been her mother, she was certainly not a daughter of Inghean Dubh.

The same reasoning can be advanced against Mrs. Concannon's statement that, when O'Neill's wife Siobhán died about the end of 1590, she 'can hardly have been more than one and twenty.' She was married in 1574, and therefore, if she was then of marriageable age, must have been in 1590 considerably more than twenty-one years of age.

The fact that Joan O'Donnell was married in 1574 to Hugh O'Neill is fundamental. Mrs. Concannon was not aware of it; hence she writes of a family gathering which 'would be occasioned by the marriage of Siobhán to Hugh O'Neill, Baron of Dungannon, about 1584.' The latter date is an inference from that of the birth of Aodh son of O'Neill, whom we know to have died in 1609, in the twenty-fourth year of his age ($1609 - 24 = 1585$). It is argued that Aodh's mother was married in 1584. But we have evidence (above quoted) to *prove* that the marriage took place ten years earlier.

Regarding Red Hugh's fostering, Mrs. Concannon says, 'we learn from O'Clery that he, immediately after his birth, was given to be fostered to the high-born nobles of the tribe of Conall Gulban, son of Niall, and it was not

¹ *Calendar of State Papers*, 29.

these alone that took him to rear and educate, but some of the tribe of Eoghan, son of Niall, took him.' It is possible to be more definite here: the *Life of Hugh Roe* mentions four of his fosterers. One was O Catháin, namely Ruaidhrí, who died in 1598; a second was Aodh Dubh O Domhnaill, his own grand-uncle; a third was Conn, son of Calbhach O Domhnaill; and a fourth was Eoghan Og Mac Suibhne na dTuath. These are all mentioned as fosterers of the young O Donnell in O Clery's *Life*. We are not to be surprised at their number, for we learn of the young child of Florence Mac Carthy being carried about the country 'to be fostered with the best, *month by month*.'¹

At page 229 Mrs. Concannon writes: 'the year 1590 was memorable in Nuala's life for two great woes; the first was the death of Siobhán, and the second was the unsuccessful attempt at escape of her brother Hugh, from his dungeon in Dublin Castle.' Of the death of Siobhán all we know for certain is that it occurred before January 31, 1591, for on that day Tyrone informed Burghley of the 'death of his countess.'² It is not correct to say that Red Hugh's escape from Dublin Castle took place in 1590. O Clery says the event occurred in January (*i ndeiredh geimhridh*) three years and three months after his capture. O Donnell was imprisoned at Michaelmas, 1587, and the period stated brings us to January, 1591. The inference is confirmed by the warrant dated January 15-25, 1591, issued to Sir George Carew 'to repair to Castle Kevin with such forces as he has, and to take command of other companies ordered to repair to his aid, for the sake bringing hither of Hugh Roe O Donnell and any other of the pledges lately escaped out of this castle.'³

What, then, of O Donnell's second escape? There is some contradiction between our two authorities on the matter, O Clery's *Life* and O Sullivan's *Historia Catholica*,

¹ *Calendar of State Papers*, March 15, 1593.

² *Ibid.* 384.

³ *Calendar of Carew Papers*, 43.

Most writers, including Standish O Grady,¹ Father Murphy,² and Mrs. Concannon, profess to follow the first mentioned. They all misinterpret what O Clery says. His words are : *baoi-siumh samhlaidh isin ccarcair chettna fot na bliadhna go deiredh geimhridh doridhisi go hoidhche nottlacc stell do shonnradh anno 1592*—‘he was in the same prison during the course of the year until the next January, until the eve of the Epiphany, 1592.’ This passage is mistranslated by Father Murphy ‘to Christmas night in the year 1592,’ a version which makes a difference of more than eleven months in regard to the event recorded. In spite of this version Father Murphy says O Donnell escaped on ‘Christmas Eve, 1591.’ This is the statement which Mrs. Concannon reproduces. It is true O Sullivan puts the event ‘a few days before the feast of the Birth of Our Lord,’ that is, before Christmas, 1591, but neither Father Murphy nor Mrs. Concannon cites O’Sullivan as authority for this view. O Clery’s *oidhche nottlacc stell* means ‘the eve of the Epiphany,’ or more literally ‘the eve of Christmas of the Star,’ referring to the star which guided the Three Wise Men.

Anybody who has made a study of Irish genealogies knows the extreme difficulty there is in connecting the children of an Irish chief with any particular wife, apart from evidence derived from Irish or English documents. The difficulty is multiplied many times when we come to deal with daughters. I think, however, I have proved above that Joan, sister of Aodh Ruadh, was not a child of Inghean Dubh, and consequently was only a *half*-sister of the chief mentioned. Subsequently to the writing of her article Mrs. Concannon discovered a third and a fourth sister, namely, Máire and Mairghréag, commemorated in a poem printed by me in *Gleanings from Irish Manuscripts* (p. 108). I can now add a fifth, who was the wife of Tadhg O Ruairc. Sir Richard Lovell, writing to the Earl of Essex, on April 7, 1599, ‘dares not affirm the report made

¹ *The Flight of the Eagle*, 181 ; *Red Hugh's Captivity*, 247.

² Introduction to O Clery's *Life*, xxxviii.

that O Rourke and his brother Teig, *who married O Donnell's sister*, are up against each other.'¹ There is possibly reference to a sixth in the following passage in a letter from Lord Justice Pelham to the Queen, dated November 23, 1579: 'Turloughe [Lynagh] hath practised a marriage between O Donnell's daughter and his son, and they two and Surli Boie sworn to assemble all their forces against the next moonlight, although since that oath the Marshal hath by good policy dealt with O Donnell and deferred the matter.'²

A good deal has been written by O'Grady, Hill, and others, about Inghean Dubh, who, as already stated, married O Donnell (Hugh, son of Manus) about the summer of 1569. It has, however, never been noticed that the designation by which she is best known is only a soubriquet or nick-name. On July 30, 1586, we hear of a 'pardon to Fynwall nyc Donyll alias nyn duff, wife of O Donell,' and on February 26, 1602-3, she is referred to as 'Innyne duffe alias Finnola ny Connell.'³ Her forename or Christian name was, therefore, Fionnghuala.

Mrs. Concannon says of this lady 'she got her son-in-law Earl Hugh' to intercede for her son just after his capture. I find no reference to Inghean Dubh's influence in O'Neill's letters on behalf of Red Hugh. They will be found in the official Calendars at the following dates: December 10, 1587, to Walsingham; February 24, 1587-8, to the Earl of Leicester; February 23, 1587-8, and February 5, 1588-9, to Walsingham.

Nuala, daughter of O Donnell, as all students of the period know, was married to the celebrated Niall Garbh.⁴ This marriage was effected prior to Hugh Roe's inauguration, which took place in midsummer, 1592. O Clery tells us that Niall's wife was *deirbhshiúr* to Hugh. The word used does not prove that the girl was a full sister of the

¹ *Calendar of State Papers*, 7.

² *Calendar of Carew Papers*, 172.

³ *Fiants of Elizabeth*, 4914, 6761.

⁴ *Life*, p. 56. Cf. *Four Masters*, vi. 2210.

young chief, for there are instances¹ where *dearbhrathair* is applied to a person who was only a *half*-brother. A few facts known for certain about Nuala are, that she deserted her husband when he joined the English side in 1600, that she went to the Continent in 1607, and that she was buried in Louvain. In 1602 Niall Garbh was contemplating a marriage with the widow² of Sir Arthur O'Neill, Turlough Luineach's son. Whether he carried out this intention or not, it is impossible to say, but it is unlikely that he remained without a partner until the year of his arrest, 1608.

In conclusion let a word be said about this Niall Garbh. Mrs. Concannon adopts in relation to his character the view that has been in vogue since O Clery penned his *Life of Red Hugh*. Now, it is to be observed that the latter work is an immense panegyric of a young chief who had just expired in a foreign land, and it cannot be expected to be quite impartial, especially when dealing with Red Hugh's enemies. Even his best friend, and the master hand in the whole business of rebellion, Earl Hugh O'Neill, is at times subordinated to the impetuous counsels of the young O'Donnell. Of Niall Garbh O Clery says 'he was spiteful and hostile, with the venom of a serpent, and the fierceness of a lion' (p. 56). Aodh Dubh O Domhnaill, another opponent of Red Hugh, he acknowledges to be *sinnsear sleachta Dalaigh*—'senior of Dalach's progeny,' and therefore best entitled to the chieftainship; but he adds: 'it was not a shame or a disgrace to him that in preference to him the royal prophesied Hugh Roe should be proclaimed.' In other words, Hugh Roe was an intruder. Niall Garbh had as good a claim as he to the chieftainship. His grandfather had been chief. Not only that, but he had actually secured a patent of all Tirconnell from Queen Elizabeth. Consequently he acquiesced in Hugh Roe's supremacy only when he could not help it. When

¹ For example, in *Leabhar Chloinne Suibhne*, § 42.

² *Calendar of State Papers*, 539. Sir Arthur's widow was a sister of Cuchonnacht Maguire, *ibid.* (1600), 478.

opportunity offered he joined the English. Several Irish noblemen at that period, and before, did the same. For example, Turlough mac Henry, of the Fews, revolted against O'Neill. Connor Roe Maguire was called the Queen's Maguire. They were traitors, of course, but their infamy is not handed down in our manuals of history in the same way as that of the unfortunate Niall Garbh. This is chiefly because O'Clery's estimate of him gained, first, the ear of the Four Masters, and after them of all the world. We may dismiss opinions of Niall like that of Sir Henry Docwra. He would have described any Irishman of his time as 'without any knowledge of God or almost any civility.' O'Sullivan's hatred towards Niall is not less marked than that of O'Clery. He refers to him by the name of Asper, 'Rough.' This epithet was traditional with the O'Donnells named Niall, and has no special significance in his case. Cox's remark that this man might well be called 'garaff, that is, rough or rude' is not based on personal knowledge, for Cox never saw him. The traditional opinion of Niall's character depends upon statements like these, both the Irish and the English authorities being strongly biassed against him. It is not surprising, then, that the picture of him which we get is not exactly the true one, and requires to be rectified by due consideration of his claims as against Hugh Roe.

PAUL WALSH.

SOME MODERN CASES OF DIABOLICAL POSSESSION

BY REV. HERBERT V. O'NEILL

IS the non-Catholic world reverting to paganism? A study of modern religions would lead one to think it is. Materialism is dead or dying. The 'naturally Christian soul' must seek the supernatural, and not finding it in the systems of established non-Catholic religions (systems established by law or by public acceptance), search is made for evidence of the spiritual in the regions of the occult.

The number of occult magazines that flourish to-day is amazing: France alone has thirty. There is not a country in Europe, except Ireland, that has not its occult reviews. Even the States of South America have each weekly or monthly publications of a spiritualistic nature. We find the *Reformador* and the *Rivista Spiritica* of Brazil, the *Constancia* and *La Fraternidad Universal* of Argentina, the *Rivista de Estudios Psiquicos* and the *A Donde Vamos* of Chili, etc. A study of these reviews reveals a growing belief on the part of quondam atheists and materialists in the existence of a *vie d'outre tombe* and of a spirit-world; whilst at the same time it manifests on the part of occultists the determination to destroy from amongst mankind all belief in the existence of the devil.

Herein lies the menace of Spiritualism and the allied cults. Herein is seen the work of the prince of darkness, who recognizes fully the truth of Voltaire's remark: 'Sathan! C'est le Christianisme tout entier; pas de Sathan, pas de Sauveur!' St. John expressed the same idea in its inverse form when he wrote: εἰς τοῦτο ἐφανερώθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα λυση τὰ ἔργα του διαβόλου. Any study,

then, that serves to establish the case for Christianity is surely worthy of attention. What a mistake it is to take up the attitude of ridiculing the idea of the direct action of the devil in Spiritualism and other occult religions. 'One can understand all that sort of thing in pagan times, but not in these days of Christianity.' But these days of Christianity are very pagan; one has only to reflect a little on the number of people there are in civilized countries who have never been baptized, who are, in other words, pagans, in order to realize what scope there is yet for 'the prince of this world.'

The following cases of diabolical possession found amongst baptized persons ought surely to convince the reader of the far greater likelihood of 'possession' occurring amongst the number of those who practise occult religions. However, before relating the account of the three cases of possession it might be as well to preface a few remarks on the signs commonly taken by the Church to indicate the real presence of the devil.

The classic book of Del Rio gives a very lengthy list of such indications.¹ Many of these are not now recognized, or are only recognized as signs under certain qualifications. The diagnosis of possession in these more scientific days has resolved Del Rio's long list into a threefold classification according as the signs are doubtful, probable, or certain.² Among the first of the doubtful signs we find 'mores agrestes et ferini'—gross and bestial conduct. This is considered a sign of possession, when neither the education nor the surroundings nor the sickness of the patient can explain its presence.

There is some difficulty in distinguishing between probable and doubtful signs. A rough distinction can be made on the basis of the possibility of their being simulated, or of their being symptoms of some disease. Father Schouppe includes under the class of probable signs 'insolitae vociferationes, ululatus belluini, horribilis vultus.' Orioli

¹ *Disq. Magic.*, lib. vi. c. 2, sec. 2, q. 3. ² *Theol. Myst.*, Schram.

quotes the same in his long list from *Memoria* : ‘ imita le voce di diversi animali, il belar della pecora, il mugir del bue . . . certi demoniaci hanno gli occhi terribili. . . .’

Dr. Ch. Hélot, in his *Névroses et possessions diaboliques*, makes very clear distinctions between such of these probable signs as may be due to maladies or to possession, as, for instance, in the case of alteration of the features (*horribilis vultus*). If this, he says, is pathological it is always accompanied by convulsions, but if due to possession it endures during the whole attack, apart from any convulsions : it is remarkable for its rigidity, which gives it at times the appearance of a mask. Moreover, the alteration of features in the case of diseased persons is always of the same type, whereas the physiognomy of the possessed is unrecognizable and, strange to say, varies in each case. A good impression of what this ‘bouleversement des traits,’ as Dr. Hélot terms it, is like, is to be found in Mgr. Benson’s *Necromancers*, where the conviction of the presence of a personality behind Laurie Baxter’s altered features is tellingly conveyed.

Further probable signs of possession are : the movements of jumping, dancing, gyration, and balancing, when these are difficult to explain physically or physiologically ; the vision of devils or strange things inexplicable on the grounds of mere lunacy ; fierce anger or temper caused by the presence of blessed objects or religious persons ; the action of crawling on the stomach like a snake without the aid of the arms or legs ; the inability to swallow or digest food or drink that has been blessed, etc.

Few, of course, of these signs would suffice of themselves to indicate a state of diabolical possession ; their value in diagnosis comes from their accumulation and repetition and from the circumstances in which they are found.

When, however, we come to the question of *sure* signs of possession we find a better agreement amongst theologians. For one thing, they concur in granting the first place to the speaking or understanding of foreign languages previously

entirely unknown to the subject. 'Si quis prius ignarus de repente linguis loquatur peregrinis' (Schouppe), 'Parla lingue straniere' (Orioli).

A second sure sign is the exhibition of erudite knowledge, regarding subjects of higher learning, by persons ill-instructed; or the knowledge of hidden things. 'Si quis occulta et absentia quae naturaliter ab homine sciri non possunt' (Schram); the exhibition of really phenomenal strength; the exhibition of phenomena contrary to the laws of physics, chemistry, or physiology, e.g., immunity from burning, levitation, etc.; and lastly, horror of sacred things, with which may be classed 'hierognosis,' i.e., the recognition of the presence of sacred things when their presence could not naturally be known.

But here again some qualifying condition must be laid down. Ordinary hypnosis and clairvoyance, where there need be no question of diabolical agency, furnish examples of many of the above 'certain' signs of possession. And in answer to the natural objection thus arising we may state that in real possession we never find but one of these signs manifested alone. It is in the complexus of indications and in the general character of the symptoms in a given particular case that we have the key to the interpretation and diagnosis of the phenomena.

The first case is given in *Luce e Ombra*, a high class and professedly scientific monthly published in Rome, for May, 1916. Maria Celeste, a peasant girl of the village of Bol-sena, was twenty years old at the time of the beginning of the 'case.' She was quite illiterate, being unable either to read or write, and speaking nothing but her own native country dialect. She suffered early from chlorosis and hysteria. Her perceptive faculties became abnormal. The trouble was attributed to witchcraft, and her case was considered one for the priest rather than for the doctor. She was brought to a certain Canon Cappeloni, who for weeks tried his best to exorcise her, with the only result that her condition became worse, and she developed 'duo-monomania.' She was treated by Franciscans and others,

with no effect. Finally, Don Domenico Polidore (late Vice-Rector of the seminary, then at the mission of Sant Andrea), a close friend of Dr. Orioli, the narrator of the case, took the case in hand and treated the girl for a year.

At first the exorcisms took place in the parish church, but later, to avoid the crowds, Maria was taken to the church of La Madonna delle Grazie, about a mile distant. She was made to kneel at the altar, though not without violent resistance, and only giving way to the power of the exorcism, as she herself said. During the prayers the poor girl used to swoon and had to be supported; the swoon being followed by a kind of ecstatic awakening.

Her whole physiognomy altered, taking on an aspect of diabolic malevolence, and the lines of the features exhibited indescribable changes. The pupils of her eyes shone with a hellish light and expression. Generally her face and neck swelled. Her voice became deep and raucous, the lips and tongue scarcely moving when she spoke. Her powers of clairvoyance were singularly strange. A simple command from her exorcist sufficed to bring about these changes in her.

In these conditions she gave evidence of powers that were wanting a moment before: her speech became of the purest Italian, with ready and suitable responses to all arguments. She entered into learned discussions of philosophy and theology, reasoning like a well-trained scholar, and showing a wonderful acquaintance with every thesis propounded. She no longer spoke like Maria Celeste, but like a devil ('Favellava non come Maria Celeste, ma come diavolo'); and of two or more opinions she habitually supported the one disapproved of by theologians. Her replies were not laconic, but lengthy, unhesitating, well-reasoned, and detailed; and what was more wonderful still, although she herself spoke in Italian during the disputations her adversary was at liberty to speak any language he liked, Latin, French, Polack, or Greek, without being able to confuse her. On this point Dr. Orioli is most emphatic: 'Il relatore giura santamente sull' onor suo d'averla

ascoltata centinaia di volte a prolungato e vivacissimo dialogismo con se e con altri, parlando altri latino, o francese, e rispondendo essa nella propria favella, ma senza errore mai d'intelligenza.' She maintained a discussion one day for three hours on demonology and transcendental psychology with Don Amanzio Dieche, a professor of theology and Doctor of the Sorbonne, who conducted his part of the discussion in French.

All contact with sacred things or nearness to them made her shudder and shrink and fly into a passion, even when they were brought near to her secretly, behind her back, and though wrapped up in paper or cloth; whereas experiments made in a like way with things not sacred made no impression on her.

She obeyed her exorcist's even unexpressed commands. Her power of second-sight was extraordinary. A striking example of this was made as a test by Federico Giraud, uncle of the narrator, who was convinced that the whole affair was an imposture. He proposed that before going to the church for the exorcisms one of them should write secretly on a piece of paper the following words in Latin: 'Rise. Go to the sacristy. Find the Missal. Take it and open it at the Gospel of St. John as read at the end of Mass, and kiss the words "*Et Verbum caro factum est et habitavit in nobis*," then return to your place.'

This was done and the paper made into a roll and taken to the place where the witnesses were, without a word being spoken of the matter either in the street or in the church. One of the witnesses held the paper in his closed fist, and approaching the exorcist asked him to command Maria to say what he had in his hand. Time after time the priest bade her to answer. She refused obstinately (as often happened when severe tests were put upon her). The exorcist grew anxious; the unbeliever smiled. The priest persisted, and finally after a quarter of an hour the energumens went straight to the sacristy. The witnesses followed her. Maria went unhesitatingly to the place where the church books were kept, and unable to read

though she was, she picked out the Missal, and without any blundering opened it at the Gospel of St. John, and kissed it just above the words 'Et verbum caro factum est.' This done she flung the book furiously on a prie-dieu and returned at once to her place by the altar. This particular incident was recently made the subject of an article in the *Revue des deux Mondes*.

To cut a long story short, poor Maria Celeste continued to be subject to crises when entering church or when she approached the holy water stoup, and if present at Mass she used to give way to fits of howling at the Elevation. Finally, she was given a home in the household of the Vicar-General at Corneto, where she died shortly after, an 'incurable.' At the close of his account Dr. Orioli sums up the phenomena of the case : Maria's second-sight, her knowledge of foreign tongues, her guttural voice, her fiendish looks, her hallucinations as to the presence of the devil and her speaking in his name, her horror of relics and sacred things, recognized as such, etc., and, whilst admitting that explanations on natural grounds hardly fit the case, prefers to suspend his judgment.

The second case is chosen from amongst sixteen accounts of possession narrated by Dr. Ch. Hélot in his *Névroses et possessions diaboliques*. Others among the cases he gives would perhaps seem to be better characterized by indications of real diabolical possession, but the preference is given to this one because of its brevity. Dr. Hélot is a medical man of note. His study of these cases is strictly scientific.

Louise X., aged nine, living in the commune of Bolbec (Havre), had always enjoyed the best of health. There was no trace of hysteria in the family. Towards the commencement of 1872 a noticeable change came over her character. She ceases to study, and pretends she cannot learn her lessons, especially not her catechism. During prayers at home or in school she professes to be ill and runs away.

A fortnight passes, during which time her character

contrasts greatly with her previous docility and application. Suddenly, at about 8 a.m., on Friday, July 19, she was seized with a dreadful fit of shivering, her whole body trembling for three-quarters of an hour, without, however, any loss of consciousness or any great feeling of coldness. There was no perspiration following on the fit, but only a great weakness in the legs. She could not walk and had to be carried. The trembling fit was repeated for some days afterwards, and several times in the day, it being now accompanied by loss of consciousness and a fixed look on her face.

On the Sunday following the first attack she complained that she felt some kind of animal moving about in her stomach which compelled her to stretch her limbs and to stiffen. She alleged that she saw a black man following her about. From this onwards the shivering fit changes to a muscular rigidity, like that of tetanus, and convulsions. She falls, becomes unconscious, drags herself across the floor, writhes and twists, clutches on to the bars and legs of chairs, and creeps under the furniture, her face all the time being drawn with fear.

The convulsions, which Dr. Hélot declares he has witnessed many a time, resemble at first sight those of hysteria and epilepsy: blinking and jerky grimaces at the outset, then movements in all directions, without the predominance of one side over the other. But in hysteria and epilepsy the movements are erratic and involuntary; the convulsions affect the patient in a particular way only; he strikes out in all directions, clutching at the objects that happen to be in the way, dropping them or picking them up automatically, without any determined purpose.

In the case of Louise the grimaces and convulsions of epilepsy and the violent transports of hysteria are certainly noticeable, but they are all co-ordinated to a determined end. For instance, if she wants to crawl between the bars of a chair—a form of exercise for which she shows a predilection—all her limbs, though apparently convulsed, co-operate to the accomplishment of her purpose. When

restraint is put upon her all her members concur simultaneously to resist. If anyone tries to draw her out from underneath a piece of furniture she will contort herself like a bow and join hands and feet; she will cling round the leg of the piece of furniture so as to necessitate her arms and legs being each separately loosened before she can be got away.

She exhibits a dread of sacred things. If holy water is sprinkled on her—not on her face, where the shock would explain her shrinking, but on her clothes; or if a crucifix is held out to her, even from a distance, or a blessed medal shown to her, she will flee away, crawling over the floor like a snake, her eyes wild with fear as they glare at the sacred object.

From almost the beginning of her trouble Louise manifested an astonishing and peculiar symptom. Whilst trying hard to say her prayers she could manage to get through the *Our Father* and the *Hail Mary*, but when saying the *I Believe*, as soon as she got to the words, ‘I believe in the Holy Ghost,’ she went off into convulsions and could not proceed. The strange thing was that she could say ‘Saint Esprit’ and ‘Je crois’ separately, but as soon as she tried to make a sentence of the words her lips contracted and the poor child could not get any further. If she insisted on trying to say the words the immediate result was a seizure.

Dr. Hélot tried, time and time again, to get her to say the words, but fruitlessly. She could say the Latin phrase, ‘Credo in Spiritum Sanctum,’ despite the fact that he explained that it meant exactly the same as ‘Je crois au Saint Esprit.’ He tried to get her to write the words as a sentence, but found it impossible. She easily got as far as ‘Je crois au,’ but as soon as she formed the curve of the ‘s’ her fingers grew rigid and she could get no further. She was made to write on another piece of paper ‘Saint Esprit,’ and then to write in front of it ‘Je crois au.’ Dr. Hélot then informed her that she had at last written the complete sentence. From that moment it was henceforth

impossible to get her to write the words 'Saint Esprit,' even by themselves.

Louise also experienced great difficulty in making the sign of the Cross. However, by dint of perseverance and after repeating the words 'Je veux . . . je veux . . . je veux,' she generally managed to succeed in the end; and the seizure which would be about to come on would suddenly miscarry. A like exertion of her strength of will, accompanied by repeated signs of the Cross, made with holy water, enabled her to say her prayers peacefully.

This state of things lasted a month, when a respite of five weeks ensued, during which time she had seizures only every third or fourth day; and these only occurred when she was at her prayers or when she was confronted with a crucifix.

During each period of bad attacks her parents used to take her away for a change to Manneville; and after a while she began to improve. However, an aunt of hers died the following December in the neighbouring commune. There had been an estrangement between this aunt and Louise's parents for a number of years, chiefly on account of jealousy on the aunt's part. Louise's father came into possession of what little property there was left. To his astonishment he found amongst the smaller articles a number of books on Magic. These he at once carried off to the Curé, who immediately threw them into the fire. There was a strange sequel (though it may quite possibly have been only a coincidence) which, considered together with certain other details, gave food for reflection. After the death of her aunt, Louise had been rather more subject to seizures, but from the very day the books were burnt the seizures left her.

Except for one very remarkable incident that occurred on the 4th of May following (an incident that, unfortunately, has to be sacrificed to brevity, but which is perhaps one of the most evidential in the history of her case) her condition was satisfactory enough till June two years later. She now began to prepare for her first Holy Communion. New

symptoms developed. Three times a fortnight she was overcome by an insuperable sleepiness, accompanied by fits of shivering and vomiting. Invariably each attack ended exactly at the hour when her lessons in preparation for her first Communion were due. She had a fresh and final seizure on Ascension Thursday. It happened in this way:

The children of the township had to go to a neighbouring church to be confirmed. Louise was ready to go with the others, but just as she passed the threshold of the door she fell full length on the road, without, however, losing consciousness. She complained of the loss of power in her legs—and, in fact, they seemed to have been suddenly paralysed. She is driven to the church in a trap. In the church she has to be dragged to her place. She is allowed to remain seated during her examination in catechism by Cardinal Bonnechose, to whom she replies distinctly and clearly and correctly. When the moment arrives for her to go to the altar for the reception of the sacrament of Confirmation she complains anew of the loss of power in her legs, and adds that her stomach has suddenly swollen. And, indeed, she was swollen out excessively; her face had grown scarlet-red, and she was near to collapsing. In spite of it all she insists, with her usual determination, on being confirmed. Her companions support her as she kneels before the Cardinal.

Then the wonder happened. Immediately she was confirmed the livid scarlet left her face, the mysterious swelling at once disappeared, her strength returned, and she was able to return to her place unaided. She was instantly and perfectly cured; and from that day right down to the day when the report was written (a period embracing several years of married life) her health remained constantly excellent.

What are we to conclude from the above details? We have seen fulfilled in this case several of the conditions accepted by theologians as probable and sure signs of diabolical possession. Hysteria might possibly explain the glare and the fixed look; it might also account for

some of the contortions—but we must remember that the contortions of the epileptic are characterized by their involuntariness and aimlessness; whereas the writhings and movements of Louise are extraordinary in their nature and are always intentional, and whilst the patient herself was not conscious of them, they gave every appearance of being controlled by an ‘intelligence.’

The hysterical patient is weak-willed and purposeless, incapable of any serious work; he is well on the road to the asylum. According to Dr. Huchard¹: ‘Elle ne sait pas, elle ne peut pas, elle ne veut pas vouloir.’ Whereas in the case of Louise, we find a strength of will and firmness of purpose that is called into action and intelligently used to enable her to overcome almost insuperable difficulties. Hysteria, according to Dr. Richer, as a rule, is hereditary. In Louise’s case there was no trace of it in her parents nor in her own children.

Insanity, likewise, will not suffice to explain the case. It might conceivably account for the state of fear that obsessed Louise at the sight of a crucifix, on the grounds of hallucination concerning the nature of a crucifix; but it will not explain how she could detect the presence of a crucifix without seeing it. Her fear extended also, we must bear in mind, to all religious things: to holy water, to blessed medals, to sacred images.

Hereditry also figures in the diagnosis of insanity. There is no trace of it in Louise’s family history. Moreover, insanity is rare before the age of puberty; and Louise was only nine years old. We may also remark that insanity is gradual in its onset, and progressive in its development; and, further, that absence of amelioration after twelve months is taken as a sign of incurableness. The onset of Louise’s complaint was sudden; her condition was not characterized by the stages usually observed in insanity; her will was not weakened; and even at the end of three years suffering her intellect, memory, and strength

¹ *Caractère, Mœurs, État Mental des Hystériques.*

of purpose were undiminished in vitality, as witness the incidents at the ceremony of her confirmation.

On the other hand, we have such signs of possession as the *mores ferini*—her crawling like a snake, her indulging in contortions unlike those due to any known malady. All her troubles seem to be concerned, as a rule, with things of religious significance—the beginning of the ‘case’ is marked by an inability to learn her catechism; it ends with the reception of the sacrament of Confirmation. She hates—or, rather, the thing that possessed her hates—to say prayers or to hear them said; though the child herself, but nine years old and a good child, insisted on trying to get through them: ‘Je veux, je veux, je veux!’ There is, moreover, the hallucination of seeing some person she cannot describe, and of whom she is afraid. And we must add the very remarkable instance of her impossibility to say or write the words, ‘I believe in the Holy Ghost,’ and later, the inability to write even the words, ‘Holy Ghost’—followed by the immediate, instantaneous, and complete cure on her receiving the Holy Ghost in confirmation. Everything had conspired to prevent her receiving this sacrament: the seizure at home, the paralysis on setting out for the church, the new crisis in the church with the dreadful swelling of her body and the extreme weakness . . . underneath all which one had a glimpse of the little soul struggling for mastery over a malevolent and mysterious enemy, and indomitably whispering, as no insane person could at such a stage of her ailment, ‘Je veux . . . je veux . . . je veux!’

The last case to be quoted is of much more recent date. It concerns the experience of the Right Rev. Mgr. Delalle, Titular Bishop of Natal, in the year 1907. He contributed an account of it to *Rome* shortly after it occurred.

As doubtless the case, being a modern one, will be in the remembrance of many of my readers ‘eam sub brevitate transcurrimus quatenus eius expositio ita nescientibus fiat cognita ut tamen scientibus non sit onerosa.’

For several months the Bishop had been receiving

letters from the priest in charge of the mission of St. Michael, declaring that two girls of the native Mission School were possessed by the devil, and permission was asked to practise the solemn exorcisms. The permission was granted, and things quietened down for a little while, only to burst out into a worse state than before. Later, the Bishop found he would be able to investigate the matter for himself. He wrote accordingly to St. Michael's, telling the priest in charge to expect him on the following Tuesday, and adding that he would bring with him Father Garrigan, of Umzinto. However, at the last moment, he changed his mind as to his travelling companion, and took Father Delagues, O.M.I., of Durban, in place of Father Garrigan.

Both the Bishop and Father Delagues scouted the idea of possession. But when it transpired that the priest had told the natives that the Bishop was coming to cast out the devils, and that prayers had been said daily for that intention by the natives, the Bishop had to take the case seriously. He then prayed God earnestly to help him. Forthwith he went to see the two girls, Germana and Monica, who were kept in separate rooms. As soon as Germana saw the Bishop she began to tremble and shake all over, shrinking from him. (We saw above exactly the same trembling and shaking and shrinking on the part of Louise in the presence of a crucifix.)

The Bishop told Germana to kneel down, which she did, gnashing her teeth. Father Delagues threatened to punish her if she did not behave. He had no sooner said this than she jumped up in a perfect fury, crying: 'Because you are from Durban you think you can do everything, even strike a spirit!' (Note, she did not know the priest nor whence he came.) She then began to tear her dress, and the Bishop went to see Monica, who was apparently suffering a great deal, but said nothing.

According to the testimony of the Priests and Sisters of the Mission, these two girls (both about sixteen years old) used to carry enormous weights, which two men could

scarcely lift. They understood Latin in their fits, and even spoke it sometimes. (Cf. Maria Celeste's knowledge of it in her 'fits' only also.) Sometimes they are lifted off the ground in spite of the Sisters holding them. At times Germana's dress went on fire without any fire being near by, and while the Sisters were holding her; at another time her bed began to burn mysteriously. The Bishop decided finally to begin the solemn exorcisms.

I ordered the four priests and three Sisters to be ready to begin at 2 p.m., in the Sisters' choir, and excluded everyone else from the church. Just before the time I had the holy water font emptied and filled with plain water, whilst I took a small bottle of holy water in my pocket . . . and waited for Germana.

The Sisters brought her into the chapel, and I sprinkled her at once with water from the font. At first she looked up with a slight shudder, but as I continued she laughed mockingly, and cried: 'You may go on, this is not holy water!'

I then took the bottle out of my pocket and sprinkled her anew; but this time she shrieked and cried, and asked me to stop.

Now, I must remark that all the time the ordeal lasted I spoke Latin only, the girl obeying all my orders, and answering me usually in Zulu, but sometimes in Latin.

After some prayers, I asked her: 'Dic mihi quomodo voceris?' to which she replied: 'Dic mihi nomen tuum!' I insisted, and she said: 'I know your name, it is Henry; but where did you see that spirits have names?'

'They have, and I command you to tell me yours.'

'Never, never!'

But on my placing on her head a relic of the True Cross, which she could not see, she cried:

'Take that away, it crushes me!'

'What is it?'

'A relic.'

'Then tell me your name.'

'I can't, but I'll spell it: "Dioar."'

'Now, who is your master?'

'I have none.'

'But you have, and you must tell me his name.'

'I cannot, but I shall write it'; and she wrote with her finger, 'Lucifer.'

Whilst we recited the *Magnificat* she interrupted again:

'Stop it, I know it better than you; I knew it long before you were born!'

As one of the Fathers commanded her to be quiet, she turned on him:

'You fool! who gave you authority over me? Did the Bishop or the Abbot delegate you?'

At times she remained quiet and disdainful; but sometimes she raged and gnashed her teeth. 'I'll make you sweat before I go out,' she

said once; then all of a sudden she begged to be allowed to go into another girl, Anastasia:

'Stop your prayers,' she said, 'they hurt me; if you stop I shall go out to-morrow morning' . . .

From time to time she went into awful fits of roaring; on such occasions I had only to place two fingers lightly on the throat and she could not utter a sound. To make a counter experiment, I asked one of the Sisters to do the same as I did, but it had no effect.

'Tell me,' I said, 'why you are so much afraid of the priest's fingers?'

'Because,' she answered, 'they are consecrated.' And she made the motion of the Bishop anointing the priest's hands at his ordination.

At 9 p.m. the Bishop decided to stop till the following morning, poor Germana begging of him not to give her up. 'I am sure,' she said, 'that if you said your Mass for me to-morrow it would be easier.' The night was awful, and the Sisters had to remain with her all through. The exorcisms began again next morning at 8.30, after she had been to confession and Holy Communion. From the very first she became unmanageable. Her hands and feet had to be tied, since the eight persons present could not control her.

'You have sent away Anastasia,' she said. 'I can see her on the way to another Mission with another girl, but I'll find her yet.'

It was true; early in the morning I had sent her away, but Germana could not possibly know of it. After awhile some one called a priest away. He came back half an hour later. 'Where has he been?' I asked.

'He has been to baptize a man who got ill suddenly.'

That also was true, though nobody in the chapel knew it. Then she asked for a drink, and she was given a cup of water. After drinking some of it she stopped: 'Wretched man,' she said, 'you gave me holy water! . . . All right, give me more still, it will not make me suffer more than I do.'

It would be too long were I to repeat everything she said. Suffice it to say that every moment it became more and more awful, until at last she tried to bite a priest. He, somewhat excited, gave her a little tap on the mouth, at which she became worse, and called him the most stupid of men, who wanted to strike a spirit. As I commanded her to keep quiet, she cried: 'Now, no more obedience.'

It was the end evidently, but the struggle was awful. At last she fell on the floor, and moaned with terrible pains. Her face swelled up suddenly, so that she could not even open her eyes, and the tears came down her cheeks. But the sign of the Cross brought the face instantly back to its natural size.

Then a kind of convulsion, and she remained motionless as if dead. *Locus vero foetore redolebat.* After about ten minutes she opened her eyes, and knelt down to thank God. She was released. 'Dioar' had gone. . . .

I have a letter in my possession, sent me by Germana afterwards, in which she begs that I may pray for her death. She has seen too much, and is afraid of life.

Note in this case the hatred of holy water, the clairvoyant knowledge, the phenomenal convulsions and strength, the familiarity with ecclesiastical matters (delegation, the *Magnificat*, the ordination ceremony), a knowledge more remarkable in the case of a young Zulu than in that of Maria Celeste. There is a curious resemblance between Germana's case and little Louise's in that a sudden swelling came on just before the cure was effected; and the fact that the sign of the Cross brought Germana's face back to its natural size, just as the sign of the Cross with chrism reduced the swelling in Louise's case. (Note, this swelling occurred also in Maria Celeste's case, but was not cured.)

In these three accounts we have the testimony of three distinct characters of men: a non-Catholic scientist, a Catholic specialist in nervous disorders, and a Bishop, regarding three separate cases in Italy, France, and South Africa. All three present convincing diagnostics of diabolical possession.

In the face of such incidents as these what can the occultist say? He hates the idea of hell; he denies the existence of the devil, and so he boggles things; but when hard pressed tells us that it is the work of 'earth-bound' spirits who, being yet 'undeveloped,' retain still their spiteful and malevolent nature and their propensities to do harm to others in this life—as if there were not scope enough for mischief-making amongst the millions who have 'passed over'! These subterfuges reveal the tendency of the day: minimize the idea of evil; condone sin; get rid of the doctrine of eternal punishment—and then belief in the devil will disappear, and so will the belief in Christianity. 'Sathan! c'est le Christianisme tout entier. Pas de Sathan, pas de Sauveur.'

HERBERT V. O'NEILL.

ART FOR ART'S SAKE

By PETER McBRIEN

I AM a comedienne, and I am proud of it,' said Miss Marie Tempest,¹ when she was leaving Australia at the beginning of this year; 'but I am a comedienne in the good sense of the word, or I am nothing. "I am a Catholic," said Verlaine, "but a Catholic of the Middle Ages!" I am a comedienne, but a comedienne of Molière's family and period.' In her protest against the decay of the English stage this charming actress instinctively harked back to the teachings of the great master of sanity and common sense who was born exactly three hundred years ago in 94 Rue St. Honoré, and who, amid all the fantastic affectations and preciosities of his day, followed robustly and imperturbably the dictates of Aristotle. Her good-bye, was, therefore, a plea for tradition, for conservatism, for gentle evolution in art.

In great art, indeed, there is no bar sinister, there never has been, there never could be, a violent break-away from the ideals of its own noblesse. Forms vary with the centuries, but the substance of art is changeless. Considering how different were the manners and fashions of the periods in which they found their milieu, it is astounding how closely Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors* resembles the *Menaechmi*, and Molière's *L'Avare* the *Aulularia* of Plautus. And yet not so astounding to the psychologist—we are all psychologists now—who discounts the vaporous theories of Haeckel and sees clear beneath infinitely varied appearances the unchanging soul of man. Under the telescope of modern knowledge and experience the idea conceived in a Greek culture is made to disclose a wider ambit of

¹ *Irish Times*, January 14, 1922.

phenomena than before. That is all. In that culture, as in the Renaissance four hundred years ago and now, the common denominator of all great art is sobriety, the restraint of the will, healthy, calm, and shining. So far as concerns this spiritual self-discipline the pagan who wrote that extraordinarily Christian line, 'Haud ignara malis, miseris succurrere disco' differs in no wise from Dante, Dante from Racine, Racine from Sienkiewicz; so that in this respect art might be said to be the most conservative thing in life outside the Catholic Church. Just as the attitude to life of the humble woman who tells her beads in the Pro-Cathedral in Marlborough Street is the same as that of Agnes or Agatha in the Catacombs, so the attitude to art of René Bazin, in Paris, is the same as was that of Aeschylus or Sophocles in Athens, and Lionel Johnson can trace his lineage unflinching back to the Stagirite. Now and then artists have broken the bonds of this self-discipline to gratify their greed or vanity or lust, but in so far as they have done so they have maimed their work and spoiled the high pleasure of those they sought to amuse.

To sweep away the grounds of that moral law attempts have been made by men like Nietzsche, men who were artists beyond a doubt. On these the epilogue of their life-work is, as a rule, epitaph sufficient: rudderless, spun dizzily through chaos, not without gleams of a certain grandeur, the grandeur of the Miltonic Lucifer, they plunge at last into a self-confessed horror and despair from which the only relief is the Nirvana of Leconte de Lisle or that inferno which differs only by its eternity from the inferno of hashish and the hypodermic syringe:

Toi, qui sais tout, grand roi des choses souterraines,
Guérisseur familial des angoisses humaines,
O Satan, prends pitié de ma longue misère!¹

The fact that one could write and, writing, publish so dreadful a prayer, indicates the depth of the abyss on the edge of which these poor beings pose and play.

¹ Baudelaire, *Les Fleurs du Mal*; Calmann-Lévy, 1868.

We Irishmen are Christians, however; we acknowledge, even if we do not always obey, the laws of Christian morality; the marrow of our soul shrivels when we read a book like *Also Sprach Zarathustra* or *The Brothers Karamazov*. We may lie, thief, murder, but when we do these things we feel we have not been sports in the game of life, in the art of life we have offended against the canons of beauty which is truth, we do not cease to assent to the fundamental rightness of Christian morality. During the last two generations a doctrine, ticketed with the label of *Art for Art's Sake* has grown into a vogue. Now, my contention is that this doctrine not merely breaks the traditional development of all great art, is not merely immoral, but definitely anti-moral. That is, its acceptance is a subversion of the Christian ethos.

The label attracts one, almost hypnotizes one with its complete and effective simplicity. Adherence to it seems to make you a freeman of the ancient and honourable borough of art. In itself it is right, telling you, as it were, you must not bother your head about money or fame or convention, you must just sing like a lark, to please yourself. You praise the artist who does so—'he is playing the game.' In the same way you praise Tilden when he asks to be allowed to play right through the next Davis Cup Tournament, as if he were an ordinary entrant and not the world's tennis champion. Tennis for tennis' sake.

Yes! But what would be your feelings if a tennis champion asked to be allowed to play in *puris naturalibus*, on the ground that clothes, no matter how flimsy, hampered his game? Of our charity we should decide that he had lost his reason. There would be the immediate and immutable implication that in a conflict between athletic perfection and Christian decorousness, athletics must give way. Now, it is precisely this that the Knut Hamsuns, the George Moores, the Anatole Frances of our day point-blank deny. We hold that the moral law transcends everything; they put art above the moral law. They forget or deny that true art must cater for the moral element in

humanity, since man is a harmonious whole, and his aesthetic faculty refuses, as a matter of common fact, to be divorced from his faculty of will. Let us not forget that Greek plays were religious ceremonies at the start.

Mark how Art for Art's Sake works out in practice. The realist—what a misnomer!—exclaims 'All the world's my quarry!' and at once proceeds to pick out from the vast lovable sum of humankind the dirty, the depraved, the sexual maniac, the idiot, for disgusting and minute examination. He gorges on carrion like a hyaena; 'unlucky hyaena who begins with the primal falsehood that nature made the universe to gratify his appetite!' ¹ His hero is a souteneur, his heroine a harlot. As though the world were not filled with good men and women. Let a great writer draw a figure of heroic penitence like Pan Andrei Kmita, ² Catholic, a golden glory of knightly splendour, and the realist who looks upon it has the uncomfortable sensation that he is trespassing on the dreary and dismal domain of the sentimental and goody-goody stories with which soft-hearted and soft-headed Christians fancy they can keep innocence ignorant, and which are the bugbear of the Catholic artist, as they ought to be, but unfortunately are not, the bugbear of the Catholic priest and teacher.

The recurring five notes of Art for Art's Sake are Squalor, Pornography, Fatalism, Lunacy, Suicide.

We Irishmen have got to face the truth of this unflinchingly. Centring, perhaps, round the Abbey Theatre, there has been a literary renaissance in Ireland, an outermost rippling from the vortices of Paris, Copenhagen, and Berlin. That renaissance has thrown up smatterers, pale weaklings of the mutual-admiration coteries, scurrying nibblers of the honest big cheese of life. These we may dismiss right away

¹ Very Rev. Wm. Barry, D.D., *Heralds of Revolt*; Hodder and Stoughton, 1904. No Catholic artist should be without this fine work.

² Henryk Sienkiewicz, *The Deluge*, translated by Jeremiah Curtin; J. M. Dent, 1902.

as good for neither man nor beast. But amongst us there are also able and conscientious artists who gravitate towards that blasphemous fatalism of Eastern Europe which represents humanity as volitionless, driven by an irresistible force to filth and crime. 'We Irishmen have affinities with the Slav,' they say, as if that were an apology, or as if Poles and Russians were predetermined racially to feast on a literature of corruption and spiritual death. And, when you deprecate their pruriency, they will answer: 'Of course the cold, hard, sensual exactitude of modern Parisian culture is un-Irish, but what is there to write about but sex; isn't sex the central interest in every human story?' You agree, and allude to the beautiful Christian ideals of sexual love; whereupon they promptly and disdainfully retort: 'Well, if you don't give them risqué bits, they'll go to European writers for them, and we'll starve.'

'Tis true, 'tis pity. For all that we have simply got to rid our minds of the touching obsession that the august conservatism of Catholicity is permanently ingrained in the Gaelic nature. Renan was a Breton. There is not one morality for our literature, as Charles Lamb would foolishly have us believe, and another quite different one for our social circle. Literary immorality is the worse, for as *littera scripta* it lasts. If we Irishmen do write salaciousness, let us at least be honest enough to admit that we are pursuing identically the same trade as the *filles de joie*.

It ought to be poor consolation for us to be able to agree with M. Recolin¹ that there is a mystic strain in Slavonic literature which lifts it above the metallic materialism of Gautier and Flaubert—the infamies of Zola and the *école de Medan* I should not regard as literature at all. Say what we will, it was from Paris that the art of Eastern Europe got its withering pessimism whereon it has superimposed a peculiar breed of mysticism which has

¹ Charles Recolin, *L'Anarchie Littéraire* ('La Moralité du Roman Russe').

produced a literature of nihilistic despair. Dostoevsky, one of its most eminent figures, who won the regard even of Vicomte de Vogüé, and of whom Nietzsche himself declared 'Dostoevsky was the only psychologist from whom I had anything to learn,' is whirled down the current of this purposeless and corroding art. Stavrogin, Kirillov, Karamazov, all end 'in the void.' The idiot, the satanist, the sadist, the suicide, these are the subjects of his vivisection—he is a greater Huysmans. And when he pictures—the horror of it!—Christ kissing Anti-Christ 'we do not know who is right—Christ or His double. *Dostoevsky did not know either.*'¹ This the common man would regard as lunacy, and this lunacy is true to type.

All the talk of our affinity with this semi-oriental art is a jargon that has no reality behind it. It has none of the serene charity or the bright reasonableness of great art, the art of Virgil, Dante, and Racine. Even with Maurus Jokai, the merriest and most human of the lot of these orientals, sexuality is also an obsession; Bessy, the heroine of that one of his novels which was crowned by the Hungarian Academy in 1890,² is, for all her charm and piquancy, a female Henry VIII, who ends her life in jail for murdering the last of her five husbands. And if Francis Thompson is rather extravagant in his presentation of the case,³ yet it is undoubtedly true that in this urbane laxity of morals in art, this curious assumption that vice is the natural outlet for human activity as portrayed in literature, we have a reflection of the moral slackness of the artist himself. Mildness, pity, terror, a humorous breadth of outlook on the world as a whole, lit by a clear ethical ideal, such

¹ Janko Lavrin, *Dostoevsky and His Creation*; Collins, 1920. The italics are mine.

² Maurus Jokai, *Eyes Like the Sea*; Jarrold, 1901.

³ Francis Thompson, *Works*; Burns & Oates, 1913. (Notes to Vol. iii.: 'Let me put it nakedly: that if Heliogabalus had possessed Shelley's brain, he might have lived the life of Heliogabalus, and yet have written the poetry of Shelley. To those who believe this, there is nothing to say. I will only remark, in passing, that I take it to be the most Tartarian lie which ever spurted on paper from the pen of a good man.')'

are the essentials of true art, and this it is that enables Father Herbert Lucas to declare that Catholicity widens the scope of dramatic literature.¹ 'Let literary Ireland make up her mind that these are the qualities she must cultivate if she does not wish to grow old before she has tasted the morning sweetness of youth.'

PETER MCBRIEN.

¹ Rev. Herbert Lucas, S.J., 'Of the Element of Tragedy in Catholic Fiction'; *The Month*, October, 1916.

THE VICISSITUDES OF THE CHURCH IN SWEDEN

BY REV. M. GIBBONS, S.T.L.

NOW that the spectre of the European War has passed, the statesmen of every nation are vying with one another in devising means to secure universal peace, excluding all possibility of a recurrence of the catastrophe of 1914. The League of Nations, established at Geneva, with great flourish of trumpets, has made a very poor attempt to realize the high ideals that were proclaimed at its inception. Only very recently, we find England and France concluding a separate agreement, absolutely ignoring and flouting the authority of that dormant body. The Washington Conference has just made another laudable attempt 'to make the world safe for Democracy,' and the attitude of the Great Powers, especially France, show, in no unmistakable manner, the difficulties that lie in their path; and success seems ever to evade their grasp. And the reason is not far to seek. Those nations who call themselves the Great Powers deliberately exclude from their peace deliberations the greatest of all powers, the kingdom of the God of Peace, the Catholic Church. Even during the European War, when the late Pontiff (whose name shall go down in history as the Pope of peace and charity) on two memorable occasions, made a glorious, disinterested appeal for peace to the belligerent Powers, his words fell on deaf ears. No, the present-day statesmen are not prepared to view the Church with friendly eyes; and though the rank materialism of the last fifty years can show no other result than the barbarity of the World War, they still persist in closing their eyes to facts, and it will possibly take a second catastrophe to bring them

to their senses. And Sweden, in its own small way, is no exception to this regrettable modern tendency. In fact, as it is one of the few countries which have enjoyed practically undisturbed peace for over a century, the germs of the so-called Modernism have had ample opportunity of developing into a full-grown organism, and hence a very cursory glance at religious conditions there may not be without interest.

Its form of government—a constitutional hereditary monarchy—has been for Sweden a very stable and comparatively efficient basis of unity and material prosperity. The King, however, has the right of veto, and as he is *Summus Episcopus* as well as King, his power for good or evil, even in Church matters, is rather excessive, and has had most disastrous results for the Catholic Church, as its sad history proves. In fact, from the days of Gustavus Vasa (1523–1560) to the present day the Church has been ‘reformed’ with a tyranny and bigotry not surpassed even in our most chequered history. And Sweden could look back to the time when her pagan warrior Vikings worshipped at the graves of their ancestors, with unhallowed rites; when the phenomena of nature were looked upon as deities; when her people offered incense, and even human sacrifice, to Thor, the god of Lightning; when, in short, her people were sunk in the depths of pagan barbarity, awaiting the advent of St. Ansgar, their Catholic apostle, who carried the torch of faith to their shores in the ninth century. And the struggle was an arduous one. The work of St. Ansgar, and his successor, Rimbert, was almost totally destroyed by internal strife among those warlike people, who considered it a disgrace to die a natural death. Hence only in 1008 did the real successful work commence. German and English missionaries, aided by friendly kings, succeeded in winning a final victory over paganism, during the eleventh century; and Eskil (an Englishman), Stephen (a German), and Botvid (a Swede) sealed their conquest with their blood. Convents and monasteries sprang up, to educate the newly-won Christians; and so energetically was the

work carried out that in 1152 they were in a position to call a National Synod at Linköping, under the presidency of a papal legate, Nicholas of Albano. In 1164 Upsala was made an archdiocese, and in 1200 King Sverker granted numerous concessions to the clergy to facilitate their work. Finally, in the fourteenth century, the Catholic Church had reached the zenith of its glory, which culminated in the work of St. Birgitta,¹ the Patroness of Sweden, the traces of whose work remain to the present day.

But, with material prosperity, abuses crept in, and we find cases of Bishops leading their armies against the Kings, which naturally resulted in grave disorders and disunion. Hence, when King Christian II, acting under the influence of Archbishop Trolle, crushed his enemies with unnecessary violence and cruelty, the Church became so very unpopular that Gustavus Eriksson Vasa found the way open, in 1523, to introduce the Reformation and overthrow the Catholic Church. A student of Lutheran theology at Wittenberg—Olavus Petri—returned to preach the new gospel at Stockholm, and Gustavus Vasa, who had already cast a covetous eye on the rich property of the Church, was his willing helper. Bishop Jacobsson, and his provost Knut, who opposed the heretics, were put to death, and at the diet of Västerås, Gustavus had himself nominated the *Summus Episcopus* of the Swedish Church, and the Reformers set about their work in earnest. The people were either duped or coerced, the monks and nuns were expelled or put to death with great cruelty (e.g., the monks of Raumo); Church property was seized and confiscated; the attempts of the Dalecarlians and Smålanders to defend the Church were extinguished in blood, and finally the second diet of Västerås (1544) abolished all Catholic ritual and customs, and declared that 'the country would never again abandon the word of God and the pure Gospel.' So the Church was 'reformed,' and Gustavus, who began life in poverty, could leave to his successors over a million thalers and immense estates.

¹ Cf. *Sainte Brigitte de Suède*, by Comtesse de Flavigny.

In 1577 a ray of hope appeared, when John III, who had married a Catholic (Katherine Jagellon of Poland), became himself a Catholic, and re-opened negotiations with Rome; but unfortunately no agreement was made, and Charles, his successor, called an assembly at Upsala in 1593, and the 'unchanged Augsburg Confession' was accepted as the religion of the State, and all other forms of worship were strictly forbidden. Thus by the end of the sixteenth century Lutheranism was triumphant in this once Catholic land. And they gave no quarter to their enemies. All non-Lutherans were expelled from the country, and after 1599 there were wholesale executions of those who adhered to the Catholic faith. And not till 1873 was the paltry concession made that Swedes over eighteen years of age were permitted to choose their own religion. As we shall see in a moment, however, the authorities took good care that, while in school, the rising generation got a 'no Popery' education, which would make them hostile to the Church for the remainder of their lives.

On October 31, 1919, the King, who wished to insist on fair play, in theory at least, issued the following proclamation to the schools: 'The teacher shall, in his instruction, avoid everything that can be considered as offensive to the convictions of others. . . . The instruction shall be such as not to come into opposition with the liberty of thought of private individuals.' And in October of last year, the Vicar-Apostolic of Sweden—Bishop Albert Bitter—basing, on this proclamation, his right to protest against the calumnies against the Church that appeared in the public school histories, issued a circular drawing attention to the deliberate falsification of history and dogma, with the purpose of poisoning the minds of the children with hatred of the Catholic Church. A few examples will suffice to show the magnitude of the struggle which lies before the Catholics in Sweden, and, incidentally, to exemplify how those apostles of liberty interpret their own much-vaunted maxims when it comes to applying them. There is nothing very new or original about their methods of attack; their

poisoned darts are chiefly aimed at three objectives: the Mother of God, the doctrine of Indulgences, and the theology of the Jesuits.

(1) *The Blessed Virgin*:—

Odhner¹ says: 'Catholics are called upon to *adore* not only Christ but the Virgin Mary.'

Gummaerus, Rosenquist, and Johannson²: 'But chiefly, they *adored* the Virgin Mary'; and again: 'The cult of Mary has grown, rather than diminished, and new forms of adoration have appeared e.g., the Heart of Jesus, the Heart of Mary, etc.'

Lundin,³ in a chapter entitled 'Idolatry in the Church,' says: 'Images of Christ, Mary, the Apostles, and other Saints were objects for *adoration*. They were venerated with kisses and bows; people even fell down and *adored* them, exactly as the heathens do with idols.'

(2) As regards *Indulgences*, their calumnies are no less bitter:—

Carl Grimberg⁴ says: 'To collect money the Popes used to send round persons who sold letters, containing the promise of the remission of their sins to the purchasers, and this remission of sin was called Indulgences. The Popes sold the remission of the sins that one had committed and also of those one was going to commit—at different prices, of course.'

Odhner⁵ makes the same accusation of 'monks going round selling pardon for sin.' We need not multiply quotations; those given prove conclusively that fanatical bigotry is as strong in Sweden to-day as it was in the days of Gustavus Vasa.

(3) The *Jesuits* are the arch-enemy, to be crushed by a very tornado of the most foul slanders. And here we cannot help remarking how complimented that distinguished

¹ *Lärobok I Fäderneslandets Historia för realskolan* (19th edition), p. 33.

² *Lärobok i Kyrkohistoria* (5th ed., 1920), pp. 46, 254.

³ *Bilder ur Kyrkans historia* (2nd ed., 1919), p. 35.

⁴ *Historia för folkskolan* (6th ed., 1920), p. 103.

⁵ *Op. cit.* p. 76.

Order must feel to find themselves singled out, by the Reformers in every country, as the key-position to be stormed before the bulwarks of the Church could be razed to the ground. A few examples of Swedish bigotry suffice :—

Gummaerus,¹ etc., in speaking of St. Ignatius, makes the following remark : ‘ In his exalted mind, he saw but one single goal, the power of the Catholic Church, and to attain this he held that all means were allowed.’ And again : ‘ Consequently the Jesuits taught, that a good purpose sanctified even bad means.’ ‘ A man may act in opposition to his conscience, if he can rely on an ecclesiastical author ’ (Probabilism).

Lundin² says : ‘ In brief, they (the Jesuits) taught them (their penitents in high social positions) to sin with a good conscience.’ ‘ The highest principle, in the moral code of the Jesuits, was that the end justifies the means.’

Pallin-Boëthius³ : ‘ To obtain the victory of the Church over her enemies, the Jesuits shirked no pains, no means however criminal they might be.’

Grimberg⁴ : ‘ If the Jesuits were ordered to lie, to perjure, to use steel or poison, there was to be no flinching ; it was for the good of Holy Church.’

Odhner⁵ tells us that ‘ the Jesuit Order was founded to convert “ heretics,” and with violence and war persecute their opponents.’

(4) The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass does not escape their venomous attacks. Grimberg⁶ explains that ‘ in the Holy Sacrifice, during the Middle Ages, the chief part of the service consisted of Latin hymns—the so-called Mass.’

(5) Our ‘ aversion ’ to the Bible is an abundant source of inspiration for those lying historians. Grimberg⁷ points

¹ Op. cit. pp. 180, 181, 254.

² Op. cit. pp. 109, 110.

³ *Lärobok i Nya Tidens Historia för Allmänna Läroverkens Högre Klasser* (8th ed., 1918), p. 28.

⁴ Op. cit. p. 124.

⁵ Op. cit. p. 91.

⁶ Op. cit. p. 44.

⁷ Op. cit. p. 102.

out that 'Luther found one day in the convent library a book that, in those days, was known to few—the Bible'; and again: 'The Catholic Church contains much that Jesus never taught.' And Odhner¹ adds: 'The form of Christianity that was preached to our fathers is called the Catholic religion, and contains much that is not found in the Bible.'

But why multiply instances? What we have quoted abundantly proves how the teachers of the Swedish youth interpret the King's proclamation of 1919 'to avoid everything that can be considered as offensive to the convictions of others.' The books from which we quote are the standard histories used in the public schools, and hence the good Bishop was merely fulfilling a very elementary duty towards justice and truth, as well as religion, in sternly protesting against such calumnies. In this instance he took their statements, one by one, and refuted them so thoroughly that his protest aroused a storm of bigotry, unsurpassed at a Twelfth of July celebration in Belfast or Portadown! Our Orange 'allies' up North would be green with envy if they could read the Swedish newspapers during this controversy! But we refrain from giving quotations from the newspaper articles by 'lay theologians'; we will just give two examples from their theological experts.

'The Roman Danger'² is the brilliant heading of an article by a Lutheran clergyman, who sees his comfortable 'living' endangered by the revival of 'Popery.' 'One must pause,' he says, 'in presence of the Bishop's declarations and shameless demands, with so much the more astonishment, since people were accustomed to look on him as of a chivalrous and true-hearted nature, free from all Jesuit sophisms and machinations. The Bishop's circular is typical of the Roman system and Roman methods. Swedish silence and meekness (!) have long enough been misinterpreted or misused,' etc.

¹ Op. cit. p. 33.

² *Svenska Dagbladet*, November 17, 1921.

Holmquist, a professor at Upsala University, bewails the new Ultramontane Papist movement, with its Neoscholastic theology, its development of the Madonna cult and belief in miracles, its prohibition to read the Bible ; all of which are subversive of the doctrine of their heaven-sent Reformer. In 1229, he says, the Council of Toulouse forbade the reading of the Bible to laymen. In France, under Louis XIV, those who were found possessing a Bible were sent to the galleys ; and, worse still, the Roman Church *still* forbids the use of the Scriptures, which, but for their revered, divinely-inspired Luther, would have been a dead-letter long since. And what is left of the real Bible in the hands of the Papists is changed and distorted to suit the dogmas of their Church. (As proof of this, he quotes Monsignor Besson, the Catholic Bishop of Geneva and Lausanne and the foremost theologian in Switzerland !) As regards the cult of Mary, he assures us that veneration and adoration are really the same thing. He goes back to the third century to prove that even then Christianity had become paganism, and 'this primitive fetishism won definite approbation in the institution of the Feast of the Immaculate Conception in 1140' ! Now, 'all the "Mothers of God" and "Queens of Heaven" (Demeter, Venus, Juno, and the rest) of paganism, are united in one single person, and the adoration of Mary is a logical sequence.' So speaks the learned Lutheran divine ; and as we stated already, the newspaper articles (and they were legion) assumed a more violently aggressive attitude, and in blind fury hurled the most scandalous invectives against the Catholic Bishop. But their fury only proves that the well-aimed dart flew straight to its mark, and Sweden has suddenly been made to realize that the Catholic Church, which they had so long regarded as dead or dormant, has burst into new life and vigour, and is determined to take its rightful place in the country which it has Christianized. And though they hurl abuse and calumny against 'those foreign intruders,' many intelligent non-Catholic thinkers have seen, and have had the manliness

to admit, that the Church was not getting fair play, and that an amelioration of existing conditions is of pressing necessity. A few of the most notable non-Catholics include the Countess Edith Bielke, who wrote an energetic protest to the leading newspapers, hotly attacking the 'De-Christianizers'; even Professor Hjalmer Holmquist, stated in the *Svenska Dagbladet* (November 27): 'If actual mistakes are to be found in our school-books, they must be corrected, and will be corrected, when they are pointed out'; and, finally, the Lutheran Bishop Ernst Lönegren pointed out in the *Härnösandsposten* (December 2) that the Catholic Bishop is justified in his protest. Liberal newspapers, and the Socialist organ *Arbetarbladet*, have been, on the whole, very reasonable also.

The Catholics themselves, very naturally, have not been slow in driving home their initial victory. Writers, both clerical and lay, have stepped into the breach. Marquess Lagergren wrote a magnificent defence of the Catholic position in the *Svenska Dagbladet* (November 23). The clergy, led by Borka, an able parish priest, have entered the lists against the critics, and have more than held their own in the newspaper controversies. The sister Churches in Norway and Denmark, where wonderful progress has been made in recent years, have come to the assistance of their brethren in distress, and, by their writings, are helping to lay bare the sorry plight of their Catholic neighbours at the tender mercies of their bigoted enemies. Johannes Jörgenssen, the famous Danish convert, has been sent to Palestine, as the special correspondent of the *Svenska Dagbladet*, the most important newspaper in Sweden, and they give his articles pride of place on their front page. The tide seems to have turned in favour of the Catholics; let us pray that it may soon be at the flood.

Modern Sweden is going through the same psychological crisis that has been experienced in the other 'reformed' countries of Europe. A twofold tendency is evident: one towards extreme Modernism, the other in the opposite direction, towards the Catholic Church. When the

confiscations, following on the Reformation, had run their course, when the coffers of the Reformation princes had been well filled with the riches taken from the Church; when fanatical demagogues fired the masses to fury against the true religion, all went well with the innovators. But as 'the most violent fires do soon outburn themselves,' and as the best-filled treasuries in time become empty, the people found themselves with only a shadow to replace the solid reality and an inevitable reaction has been the general result. Many had been so convinced of the vices of the 'Church of Rome,' that they could not bring themselves to seek refuge in that haven; and, as they also saw the falsity and hypocrisy of Lutheranism, they became disgusted with both Rome and Wittenberg, and turned to modern systems of philosophy of every shape and form. A cursory glance at Sweden explains the point.

Modernism holds undisputed sway in all the non-Catholic sects, and Swedish non-Catholic 'theology' reeks with it. Its adherents are growing in numbers, day by day, and the non-Catholic sects remain absolutely passive before its onslaughts. 'The highest spiritual ruler of the State Church, all the professors of theology at the Universities, the generations of clergy trained by them, and the vast majority of laymen, who practise religion at all, are enthusiastic supporters of Modernism.'¹ The old defenders of positive theology are passing away, one by one (Professor Rudin, an advocate of the old mystic school, and Professor Holmström both died last year), and no one has since been found to carry on their work. Though in the domain of Theology the greatest latitude is permitted for all the fantasises of Subjectivism, this fact alone does not explain the rapid disintegration of the Lutheran Church. A more powerful factor is to be found in the abject slavery of the Church to the State—a factor which has gathered strength through the advent of the Liberals to power. The 'Church Assembly,' who formerly could legislate with 'King and

¹ See *Credo*, the Catholic Swedish monthly magazine, 1922 (January).

Riksdag' in spiritual affairs, cannot now have a voice in such a small matter as the use of prayer-books in their churches. In June, 1921, the King compromised with the Liberals, to the detriment of the Church, and the latter never even made a protest. Hence, with the germs of dissolution from within, and Liberal interference from without, the days of the Lutheran State Church seem numbered. A small body of High Church clergy made an attempt last year to revive the religious spirit in their ranks, and in the autumn they held a retreat 'according to the spirit of the Exercises of St. Ignatius.' It was a feeble attempt, and Modernism continues its victorious advance, sweeping all before it, with only one obstacle to block the way—the Catholic Church. Surely it is a crisis of unparalleled importance in the destiny of the Church, in that once Catholic land. The forces of the Church, against such terrible odds, are small, but well-organized and determined, and, judging by the progress made in recent years, they are more than holding their own.

In 1891, according to Monsignor Bitter, the Catholics could count only 3,000 souls, and in 1905 Father Von Chriestersen tells us the numbers had not increased. They had, he tells us, fourteen priests, Secular and Jesuits, only two of whom were Swedes. There were six parishes, two of which were at Stockholm. The Sisters of St. Joseph de Chambéry, and of St. Elizabeth of Breslau, fifty-two all told, taught in the schools, and nursed the sick. At present the number of Catholics has increased to 4,000, in a population of 6,000,000, with twenty priests; so, though the progress is slow, it is gathering strength; and with the sympathy and help of liberty-loving countries, the future is by no means dark. A real difficulty lies in the fact that most of the clergy are foreigners, and anti-Catholic propaganda uses this as a weapon of attack. The Catholics are coupled with the Soviets, who come to Stockholm to win favour for the Bolshevik regime, and the 'Red Terror' is united with the 'Black Terror' to prejudice the unwary. Fortunately, however, there are three Swedes studying theology at present, and more are sure to follow their

example. Conversions, too, amongst the higher classes, who go abroad to study, are becoming more and more frequent. Hence 'the Catholics look to the future with much confidence,'¹ especially as the Bishop's protest, and the controversy which has since continued has thrown a flood of light on the Catholic position; and the Swedes, highly educated as they are, are glad to hear the truth; and divine truth and its guardian, the Church, will triumph in the end. The Catholics have recently busied themselves with thoroughly organizing their weak forces, and the 'Congregation of Mary' found itself sufficiently strong last year to organize a pilgrimage to Björkö—*the island where St. Ansgar first preached*. It was the first since the Reformation, and was a complete success. Public Catholic Conferences have been organized in Stockholm, 'to favour information on Catholic teaching by conferences, and, if possible, by collaboration, with similar institutions in the Scandinavian countries.' The advance is slow, but at the same time it is steady, and against a disorganized Babel of warring sects their ultimate victory is more than probable. While it is painfully evident that an enemy has come in the night, and sown cockle among the corn, still, with St. Birgitta and countless other saints and martyrs, to give her spiritual strength and vitality, Sweden cannot fail to reap a bounteous harvest in God's good time. Norway and Denmark have given the lead, and Sweden is making a manly attempt to follow. Could we not extend to them the charity of our prayers, we who have been the apostles of the Faith in so many Catholic lands; we who have only recently sent the cream of our priesthood to convey the glad tidings of the Gospel to heathen China; we who have felt the fire of persecution burn into our inmost souls—could we not extend a helping, sympathetic hand to our struggling brethren in their darkest hour, in the fervent hope that their star may soon arise in the East, to lead them straight to Bethlehem and to Christ?

m. mac 510búin.

¹ *Credo*, 1922.

NOTES AND QUERIES

THEOLOGY

ASSISTANCE AT MASS

REV. DEAR SIR,—A person culpably misses a notable part of his Sunday Mass. He arrives before the Consecration. Is he bound *sub gravi*, or even *sub levi*, to assist at the remainder of the Mass? If so, whence arises this obligation? If he neglects to do so, is he guilty of a two-fold mortal sin? If so, why? I am viewing the case quite objectively. There is no thought of contempt. It is the case of a person with a *conscientia efformata*.

APPRECIATIVE QUEENSLANDER.

When there is question of assisting at a Mass of obligation, two points must be kept in mind and carefully distinguished. First, the primary intention of the Church is to ensure the attendance of the faithful at the portion of the Mass that constitutes the essence of the sacrifice. Secondly, there are ritual observances and prayers that, by common consent, do *not* constitute portion of the essential rite, but are at the same time so closely connected with the sacrifice that they assume a grave importance and cannot be omitted deliberately without grievous sin.

The principles are clear enough, but their application entails some difficulties. For there is a considerable difference of view as to what exactly *does* constitute the essence of the sacrifice, and as to how many of the non-essential rites may be omitted before grave matter has been reached. On the first point we have quoted the authorities more than once already: some of them find the essential elements in the Consecration, some in the Communion, some in both combined; others in such unlikely portions of the Mass as the Offertory or 'Little Elevation' that precedes the *Pater Noster*. As regards the non-essential rites, sufficient evidence of difference of view will be found in every theological manual. But, leaving unlikely theories aside, we are justified in stating:—

1°. That absence from the beginning of Mass to the Offertory, inclusive, involves mortal sin.

2°. That the essence of the sacrifice is certainly found somewhere between the beginning of the Consecration and the end of the Communion.

3°. That most probably it is found in the Consecration alone.

Examining 'Queenslander's' case in the light of these conclusions, we find that the individual concerned has committed a mortal sin. He

has made it impossible for himself to fulfil what may be described as the 'secondary' purpose of the Church. But it is still within his power to fulfil the 'primary'—to assist at the sacrifice itself. Is he bound to do so? We see no reason whatever for denying it. Our primary obligations do not come to an end when, through our own fault or otherwise, our secondary duties have become impossible. 'Queenslander's' friend is, therefore, bound *sub gravi* to remain.

That, we think, will be found to be the view of all the most reliable authorities.¹ There is no need to quote them in detail. One indication is enough. When 'Queenslander' consults our ordinary text-books, he will often meet the query 'whether a person who arrives *after* the Consecration is bound to remain,' but very rarely any question as to the obligations of a person who arrives *before* the Consecration. The affirmative reply is taken for granted. And the reason given for a negative reply to the query actually put indicates *per contrarium* that the opposite reply would have been given in 'Queenslander's' case. For the answer generally runs: 'A person who arrives after the Consecration is not bound to remain, *because* it is impossible for him to be present at the essential portion of the sacrifice.' When it is *not* impossible—when he arrives *before* the Consecration—the one reason for denying the obligation vanishes.

If an express statement is preferred, the following, taken from the Saberri-Barrett compendium, may be taken as typical: 'An debeat reliqua audire qui post consecrationem adveniat? Nego . . . Verum si quis veniret ante consecrationem, teneretur ad reliquam partem Missae propter rationem contrariam et communem Doctorum auctoritatem.'²

'If he neglects to do so, is he guilty of a two-fold mortal sin?' Very rarely, we should say. The problem must be solved on the principles governing the numerical distinction of sins. If, finding he has missed a notable portion of the Mass, he decides to wait for the remainder, and after a time deliberately changes his mind and leaves, there is a two-fold sin undoubtedly. But in practice that hardly ever happens. His frame of mind is the same all through. If he leaves at all, he does so in virtue of some general intention formed before he entered the church. His sin, if he leaves, will certainly be more serious than it would have been had he remained: but, morally speaking, the act is one—the more serious portion absorbs the less, and the sin, when confessed, will be confessed as one.

We may illustrate the matter in this way. A man has planned, let us say, to commit a very serious crime, and the moment has come for its execution. The crime itself is the 'primary' thing to be avoided, the deliberate planning of the crime the 'secondary.' He has violated the

¹ Cf. Ballerini, p. 336 (note b); Ferreres, i. 428, q. 3; St. Alphonsus, n. 310, etc. The Saint extends the obligation in practice to the case of a man who comes *after* the Consecration—on the strength of the opinion that the Communion is portion of the sacrifice.

² n. 242, q. 3.

secondary obligation already: is he still bound by the primary? Undoubtedly. May he say to himself: 'I have sinned grievously already; if I persevere in my purpose I can hardly be worse'? No: for, whatever we may hold about the malice of efficacious desires, in practice the complete sin will be much more grievous. If he carries out his purpose, without change of mind in the meantime, is he 'guilty of a two-fold mortal sin'? No: the act is morally one from first to last, and the greater absorbs the less.

The parallel is not quite complete, but is sufficiently close to illustrate the principle. 'Queenslander' may work out a better example by supposing the case of a man who has unjustly ruined another's reputation [the principal and 'primary' offence] and thereby already inflicted an injury that can never be repaired [a grave offence, but 'secondary']. Though the latter crime is beyond repair, the obligation to restore the victim's reputation still remains. But failure to fulfil it will not entail a *new* sin—in the great majority of cases.

RESTITUTION

REV. DEAR SIR,—Caius owes a creditor a considerable sum of money. He is unwilling, for many reasons, to make restitution directly. So he pays the money to Julius, a special friend of the creditor's, and gets his promise that the money will be duly paid. Through accident or design, the money never reaches the creditor. Is Caius bound to pay a second time?

C. R.

Making all possible allowances for Caius, we are afraid all we can say is that the opinion in his favour is just barely probable. In matters of justice, that is not, we believe, sufficient to excuse him from the inconvenience of paying the amount a second time. At the most, it will justify a confessor in saying nothing about the obligation if he finds that Caius is determined not to make restitution and that insistence on correct principles would have no effect except to rob him of his *bona fides*.

One of the first principles in regard to restitution is that the debt must be paid to the creditor or to his agent. The latter may be appointed expressly, either by the creditor himself, or by the debtor on authority given by the creditor, or by some person duly authorized to settle the manner and the means of restitution. But he may be appointed also implicitly—and this is the only method that can be alleged in the case before us. Was Julius so appointed? The test is this: Were the relations between Julius and the creditor such that, before the case actually occurred, the latter would have willingly consented to have all his debts paid through Julius as intermediary? If so, Julius was his agent and the restitution is complete as soon as Julius receives the money. If not, Julius may be Caius' agent, but he certainly is not the creditor's, and restitution is not effected until the money actually comes into the creditor's possession.

There may be some special circumstances in the present case that would throw new light on the relationship between Julius and the creditor, and justify us in regarding the former as an agent. There is no mention of these, however, in 'C. R.'s' letter. So we must fall back on general probabilities and on the ordinary practice in commercial life. And the lesson to be derived from them, we fear, is that creditors may be quite willing to have restitution made in the manner indicated—but always with a proviso, viz., that the intermediary fulfil his commission. The consent is conditional: and, until that condition is fulfilled—as it was *not* in Caius' case—the obligation remains as before.

The authorities refer to this matter only in a casual fashion, when discussing the question of restitution made through a confessor. 'C. R.' will remember that, even in regard to the confessor, the most liberal theologians can only say that the opinion exempting the penitent from a second payment is 'not improbable' or 'cannot be altogether condemned.'¹ If there were special question of other intermediaries, their statements presumably would be still more hesitating. Unfortunately for Caius, these hesitating statements are the only ones he can invoke.

ARE ALL FIRST COMMUNICANTS BOUND TO CONFESS?

REV. DEAR SIR,—For several years past, priests on the mission, and parents and teachers as well, have had their duties very clearly defined in regard to children's Confession and Communion. Grave obligations have been multiplied in a way that would have astounded our predecessors. Are we not in danger of pushing matters beyond all due limits? I think we are.

Granted that children of seven years, and a great many younger still, are bound to receive Communion, does it follow that they are bound also to confess, or that priests and parents are bound to provide for their Confession? So far as I have read theology, I find no justification for saying that anyone is bound to Confession before he has committed mortal sin. Can it be maintained that the majority of our present-day first Communicants have committed mortal sin or are even capable of it? It would seem to me that there are two 'ages of discretion'—one for Communion, another, much later, for Confession.

The parents send the children to Confession: we hear the confessions as a matter of course. No discussion on the subject will change that. But, to me at least, it would be a consolation to know that we are doing something to which we are not strictly obliged. A reply would be gratefully received.

CONFESSOR.

The remarks of 'Confessor,' and others that might be quoted, indicate a strange bouleversement in the theological thought of recent years.

¹ A good summary of theological views, and a fairly satisfactory list of authorities, will be found in Lehmkühl's treatise, i. 1552.

Previous to the date of the *Quam singulari* decree,¹ it was commonly held that a child was qualified for Confession, and bound by the precept, long before he was sufficiently developed to be admitted to Holy Communion. As a result the custom, in many localities at least, was to admit him to Confession about the age of seven, but to postpone his first Communion until he had reached the age of ten, or perhaps even fourteen, years. Things have now swung round in the opposite direction. The decree obliges even rigorists to admit that Communion is obligatory when a 'certain use of reason' (*aliqualis usus rationis*) has been attained; and among the marks of that development the Code mentions 'capacity to distinguish the body of Christ from ordinary food' (854, § 2) and 'such knowledge as their age allows of the necessary mysteries of faith' (§ 3). These attainments are acquired at the age of seven, and in many cases considerably earlier. But in regard to Confession no change has been introduced. The principle still holds, as 'Confessor' states, that the obligation cannot fall on anyone who has not committed mortal sin. When some theologians apply that principle, they easily convince themselves that many of the children mentioned in the Code (854, § 2, § 3) still fall within that category. In their view, the net result is that, while formerly Confession came first and Communion some years afterwards, the order now is reversed in many cases—the obligation of Communion comes first, that of Confession considerably later.

Their opinion gets some countenance from a controversy that has divided theologians for centuries and has never been settled satisfactorily, viz., as to whether, in the course of normal development, a person becomes capable of offending God mortally as soon as he becomes capable of committing a venial fault. St. Thomas and a long array of theologians, it will be remembered, adopt the affirmative reply²: all the conditions for mortal sin are possible, they believe, as soon as the child is sufficiently developed to commit even a venial offence. Suarez and an equally long array of theologians take the opposite view: a child, they think, may sin venially without having attained the power of advertence and degree of responsibility required as conditions for a grave transgression. Into the merits of the controversy we need not enter: we only recall it to illustrate how a follower of Suarez can logically hold that those who are capable of sinning venially and who fall under the obligation of Paschal Communion—those mentioned in Canon 854, § 2, § 3³—may still be insufficiently developed for the commission of such serious offences as would subject them to the precept of annual Confession.

But, whatever our view on the theoretical question, one point is perfectly clear. In practice no distinction is to be drawn between

¹ 8th August, 1910.

² *Summa*, I, II. q. 89, a. 6. For a list of authorities on the same side, cf., e.g., the Salmanticenses, tr. 13, d. 20.

³ The tests furnished in Canon 854 are about the same as the ordinary theologian would apply in deciding capacity for venial sin. That view of them is confirmed by the reply, given below, from Cardinal Gasparri.

different ages of discretion—the age for first Confession and the age for first Communion are one and the same. On that point all the authoritative pronouncements are in agreement. In these documents there is no mention of the speculative difficulty : there is evidence enough, in fact, that the question was avoided deliberately. The legislators confine themselves to formulating a practical rule, leaving the theologians to follow their favourite theories and reconcile them as best they can with the practical precepts of the Church.

Take, for instance, the pronouncement of the Fourth General Council of Lateran ¹—the first of the series. There is no reference to theory : the two precepts are put side by side and the same age specified for both :—

‘Every one of the faithful, of both sexes, after they come to the years of discretion, shall, in private, faithfully confess all their sins, at least once a year, to their own priest . . . receiving reverently, at least at Easter, the Sacrament of the Eucharist.’

The Council of Trent followed on the same lines. It confirmed the Lateran decree, anathematized all who refused to conform,² and mentioned the ‘years of discretion’ without making a distinction between the two sacraments.³ It went further. In the 21st Session ⁴ it stated that ‘little children who have not attained the use of reason are not by any necessity obliged to the Sacramental Communion of the Eucharist,’ giving as the reason the fact that ‘they cannot at that age lose the grace they have already acquired of being the sons of God.’ This line of reasoning, if logically followed, leads of course to the conclusion that the obligation begins when they *can* lose the grace, or, in other words, when they are capable of committing grave sin—the very same age at which they are normally bound by the precept of Confession.

But, of course, our main authority on this matter is the *Quam singulari* decree, which treats the subject *ex professo*. ‘In fixing this age of reason or of discretion [it says] not a few errors and deplorable abuses have been introduced in course of time. For there were those who considered that a different age of discretion was to be fixed for the reception of the Sacrament of Penance, and for the reception of the Holy Eucharist. . . . The abuses we are condemning arise from the fact that those who assign a different age for Penance and Holy Eucharist have not defined with precision and accuracy what is meant by the age of discretion. The Lateran Council, however, requires one and the same age for both sacraments, since it imposes as one the joint obligation of Confession and Communion. And so, just as for Confession the age of discretion is held to be that at which wrong can be distinguished from right, that is, at which a certain use of reason is attained ; so, too, for Communion the age of discretion must be held to be that at which the Eucharistic bread can be distinguished from ordinary bread : which, again, is the

¹ Canon 21.

² Sess. 13, ch. 8, c. 9.

³ Ibid.

⁴ c. 4.

same age at which the child attains the use of reason.' From a practical point of view, the statement is as clear and explicit as could be desired. Further on we find the principle re-asserted in the first of the eight rules which sum up the teaching of the document: 'the age of discretion, alike for Confession and for Holy Communion, is the age at which the child begins to use its reason. . . . From that time begins the obligation of satisfying the twofold precept of Confession and Communion.'

Subsequent replies are in exactly the same sense. When the Bishop of Valleyfield, for instance, asked 'whether children who have not yet attained their seventh year, but have reached the age of discretion and been admitted to first Communion, are bound by the twofold precept of annual Confession and Communion?' the reply, given on the 3rd January, 1918, was, 'Yes. And the reason is clear. For, though Canon 12 states that "those who have attained the use of reason, but have not yet completed their seventh year, are not bound by merely ecclesiastical laws," it adds "unless in the law there be express provision to the contrary." And in Canons 859, § 1, and 906, there *is* such express provision. . . .'

On all of which we may make a few observations:—

1°. No matter how strongly we assert that the age for both precepts is the same, there is, after all, a difference that cannot be ignored. The precept of Communion binds at the age of discretion, whether mortal sin has been committed or not: the precept of Confession only in the hypothesis that mortal sin *has* been committed. It may, therefore, happen that in individual cases the obligation of Confession does not arise for years after the other had been in force—in fact, it may never arise at all. The general statement must be taken, therefore, as expressing the facts only in broad outline.

2°. The pronouncements quoted above—and the fact that the obligation of Paschal Communion would seem to be *grave* even in the case of the children mentioned in Canon 854—are more easily reconciled with the Thomistic than with the Suarezian view. Still, no express decision to that effect has ever been given—the point has been cautiously and consistently avoided. And a Suarezian theologian is free to hold that the period between the two 'ages of discretion' is short enough to justify us in saying that they both fall within the same year, and that, broadly speaking, the dates of the two precepts coincide.

3°. In practice, there will be no trouble whatever about the matter. The only result of the controversy would be to postpone the date of Confession. But no one thinks of admitting a child to Communion without previous Confession—in fact, Confession is the normal means by which the child's capacity for receiving Communion is tested and determined. However theorists may differ, the actual law and the actual practice are completely in harmony.

Still, these theoretical difficulties do give trouble sometimes. 'Confessor's' letter shows it. And some documents recently published¹ indicate that his anxieties are shared by his Continental brethren. The

¹ *Hostia*, January, 1921.

replies quoted were given by Cardinal Gasparri: and, though not yet published in the *Acta Apostolicæ Sedis*, are, of course, of great importance and high authority. They do not throw much light on the theoretical question, but they certainly do nothing to modify conclusions drawn from the documents already cited.

The question put to the Cardinal was: 'Is the use of reason which the Code mentions in Canons 854, § 2, 3, 5; 859, § 1, and 906 that which is necessary for the commission of a mortal sin, or that which suffices for the commission of a venial offence?' Had the Cardinal been anxious to settle the theoretical discussion, the query would have offered a splendid opportunity. If he favoured the Thomistic view, he had only to say that there was no basis for the query—that the two ages were identical. If he preferred the Suarezian, he could answer the question directly and in detail. But he did neither. Like his predecessors, he preferred to say nothing about theory, and his reply, given to the Bishop of Norcia on the 24th February, 1920, took this form: 'The use of reason for Holy Communion is that indicated clearly in Canon 854, §§ 2 and 3; and the use of reason for the annual precept of Confession, mentioned in Canon 906, is the same as has been required heretofore.' The statement implies the well-acknowledged fact that the legislation of Pope Pius X, and the canons of the Code based upon it, have effected a change in the prevailing custom regarding *Communion*. It also indicates that the Code itself (854) supplies the tests for determining the age of discretion, and that previous attempts at definition may be disregarded. But, beyond that, it commits the Cardinal to nothing.

We are furnished, however, with a second document. The Bishop had a personal interview with the Cardinal, and drew his attention to the question again. The Cardinal's reply is recorded in a letter of the Bishop's. It runs: 'It is so clear and obvious that Canons 854 and 859 speak of the use of reason which suffices for the commission of a simple venial sin that there was no need to give an express explanation: consequently, Bishops are obliged to correct those who teach and practice the contrary.' Here again the statement is restricted to the narrowest limits. There is no mention of Confession; nor is any view expressed as to whether capacity for *mortal* sin has been attained at the period indicated by the Cardinal. A keen controversialist might claim that the Suarezian view is implied. But really we are left to our own conjectures. Confessors are not to be too strict in determining the conditions for first Communion—that is the real force of the reply. Once the Eucharist has been received, the obligation of Paschal Communion arises (859); and the whole trend of legislation—which the reply does nothing to weaken—is in favour of the view that, in practice at least, the law of annual Confession comes into force simultaneously.

We may, therefore, sum up:—

1°. The speculative question is not settled; it has been deliberately left untouched.

2°. In practice, the two laws should be regarded as coming into force at the same time.

3°. There will be exceptions, of course—cases, even in which the law of Confession never comes into force at all. But they do not interfere with the general principle.

4°. Capacity for venial sin must be taken as the test. [Ordinary prudence, we may add, would suggest the policy. Venial sins are more frequent and more easily detected : there is no need for strict inquisition.]

5°. The ordinary practice of the faithful is quite in harmony with Church legislation.

6°. A Confessor who delays Communion on the pretext that the child cannot commit a *mortal* sin, violates the law of the Church and contributes to the deplorable results that the *Quam singulari* was intended to remove.

M. J. O'DONNELL.

CANON LAW

QUASI-DOMICILE AND OFFERINGS

REV. DEAR SIR,—The question of the allocation of funeral offerings in certain circumstances, introduced by 'Carrickduff' in the October number of the I. E. RECORD, treated since by 'Mullaghduff' and 'Dubius,' raises an issue of such importance in the financial and peaceful relations of parishes, that perhaps you would kindly give me the opportunity of presenting the following for the consideration of those intimately concerned.

The case as considered was : A parishioner having his domicile in one parish, acquires, by residence in hospital, a quasi-domicile in a second parish ; and dies there. His friends bring his remains to the church of the home parish of domicile ; the funeral ceremonies and funeral offerings take place there, the question then arises : which church, the one of domicile or the one of quasi-domicile, had, in the circumstances, the *jus funerandi* ?

I take it that the well-known statute of Armagh, even if unimpaired by the New Code, does not apply. The death did not take place outside the parish of the deceased. The Statutes of Maynooth gives us no guidance. We must, therefore, seek the solution of the question at issue in the prescriptions of the general law of the Church.

The Canon of the Code that applies to our case is Canon 1216, § 2, which runs thus : 'Si defunctus plures habuerit parochias proprias, ecclesia funeris est ecclesia parochiae in cujus territorio decessit.' This was the pre-Code law, as Cardinal Gasparri gives as a reference in his notes (S.C.C. 12 Mart. 1881), and Laurentius (*Institutiones Juris Ecclesiasticae*, n. 761), giving as a reference Schmalzgrueber (in lib. 3, x. tit. 28, n. 39), states the law of his time thus : 'Si quis plura habet domicilia vel quasi domicilia, ibi

humatur ubi diem supremum obiit.' The *vetus jus* and the canon of the New Code coincide; Canon 1216, § 2, must receive the same interpretation as authority and approved authors had already given to the terms of the pre-Code law.

Wernz (*Jus Decretalium*, tom. iii. p. 495, note 28) supplies us with an interpretation of the former law, which he fortifies by authority. This interpretation must obviously be the correct interpretation of 1216, § 2, as it applies to our case. This distinguished canonist states: 'Quod quasi domicilium in ordine ad excludendum proprium parochum veri domicilii a jure funerandi, non sufficienter acquiritur per receptionem in aliquod *hospitale civitatis*.'

He quotes as his authority for this statement decisions, amongst others, of the S.C.C., 19 May, 1888, and 11 April, 1891. These references are not at hand, but a canonist of the reputation of Wernz would not give the above interpretation without careful investigation of his authorities. Accepting this view of Wernz, we seem to be forced to hold that in the case proposed by 'Carrickduff' the parish of quasi-domicile acquired by right of residence in hospital, must yield the *jus funerandi* to the home parish of domicile where the funeral ceremonies and funeral offerings were held.

The above view, giving quasi-domicile in contest with domicile a similar portion of inferiority as is found in Canon 90, § 1, in Canon 956, and from which it is saved in Canon 1562, § 2, by the reverence due to the 'Romana Sedes, omnium ecclesiarum mater et magistra,' I would respectfully submit as a basis of a reconsidered reply to the original query of 'Carrickduff.'

PASTOR.

We cannot agree with our correspondent that, when death occurs in the parish of the deceased, the allocation of funeral offerings in the Armagh Province is regulated by the provisions of the general law. It is true that the well-known statute of Armagh deals explicitly only with the exceptional case in which one dies outside one's own parish. In the normal case of death in the deceased's own parish the prevailing practice was well defined, and evidently, in the opinion of the Synodal Fathers, not in need of any change; seeing that they did not explicitly legislate upon it. We have it from many well-informed sources that, in accordance with this practice, all the offerings went to the clergy of the parish in which the death occurred, no matter whether the deceased belonged to one or several parishes. Certainly the replies from Maynooth on this matter for the last ten years have been based on this hypothesis; and in the almost innumerable queries and cases which have been sent here for solution we do not think that it has been ever previously called in question.

This practice is implicitly recognized and confirmed by the Armagh law itself. According to express terms of the law, when a man dies

outside his own parish, no matter where he elects to have his funeral rites performed, one-fourth of the offerings go to the clergy of the parish in which the death occurred and three-fourths to the clergy of his own parish. Now, if the normal case be governed by the general law, and not by the special discipline just mentioned, this absurd conclusion follows, that, when a man dies in his own parish but elects to have his funeral rites performed in another, the clergy of the latter would have a right to three-fourths of the offerings and the clergy of his own parish only to one-fourth. It would also follow, in regard to those hospital cases which have given rise to this controversy, that, if a man died in a hospital after having acquired a quasi-domicile by residence for the greater part of a year and elected to have his funeral rites performed in the parish of his domicile, all the offerings would go to the clergy of the latter; whereas, if he died after a residence, for example, of one month, no matter where he elected to have his funeral rites performed, the clergy of the hospital parish would have a right to one-fourth of the offerings. Other conclusions quite as much out of harmony with the explicit regulations of the law can be also deduced.

Even though it were true that this case was governed by the general law, we should have to disagree with 'Pastor's' other contention—that the quasi-domicile acquired by patients in a hospital gives no right to the *jus funerandi*. The only reason advanced by him for this view is a statement from Wernz. Now, what Wernz really says, although the word *sufficiens* is slightly ambiguous, is that a patient in a hospital does not acquire a quasi-domicile at all; and this was quite true as a general rule before the publication of the Code. The reason, though Wernz does not give it in the place referred to, is that patients have not the intention of remaining in the hospital for the greater part of a year. A quotation from a decision regarding funeral offerings, given by the Rota in 1914, puts very concisely the pre-Code position in this matter:—

'Jus hoc commune applicandum esse parochianis extra parochiam in hospitali decedentibus patet ex eo, quod communiter aegroti recepti in hospitali non habent intentionem ibi per majorem anni partem commorandi sed potius inde quam primum exeundi, unde ibi nec quasi domicilium contrahunt, ideoque remanent parochiani illarum parochiarum, ad quas pertinebant priusquam hospitale ingrederentur. Et in hoc sensu saepius respondit S. C. Concilii, v.g. in Bononien. 13 Feb. 1695, in alia Bononien. 24 Jan. 1857, et in Apuana, 19 Maii 1888.'¹

As a general rule, therefore, hospital patients have not the intention of remaining in hospital for the greater part of a year, and hence, in pre-Code days, they did not, as a rule, acquire a quasi-domicile. It follows, indeed, from this, that under the old legislation residence in a hospital did not confer the *jus funerandi*. Under the Code, however, this is no longer true, because now residence alone, without any intention, suffices for the acquisition of a quasi-domicile.

¹ *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 1914, p. 555.

Whilst we are engaged on this subject of funeral offerings, we desire to make a few remarks on the contribution of 'Alter Dubius,' published in the February issue. By the way, it appeared in the 'Correspondence' section, because it reached the Editor after the Canon Law section had been printed and the author expressed a desire for immediate publication.

Broadly speaking, this contribution consists of two parts: a plea for a change in the Armagh discipline, in so far as it affects the class of cases round which this whole controversy centres; some considerations to show that, even independently of such a change, *parocchia propria* should have the same denotation as in pre-Code days. With the plea for a change, which is based on the supposed inequity of the law, we are not much concerned. It is not at all our position that the Armagh discipline represents the most equitable distribution possible of funeral offerings; in fact, considering the fallibility of the human intellect, most probably it does not; but it is not necessary, we need scarcely state, that a law should be the best possible in order that it be binding. Our position is that, if there be inequity at all, it is not such as to render the law invalid. In our reply to 'Carrickduff' we outlined some of the reasons which led us to this conclusion; we shall now merely add to them one or two further considerations which tend in the same direction.

There is no doubt whatever that the general law, in the particular case under consideration, puts the parish of the domicile and the parish of the quasi-domicile on the same footing: Canon 1216 states without distinction that, in the case of one who had several parishes and who had not selected any church for the funeral rites, the church in which the death occurred has the *jus funerandi*, and consequently also the right to the funeral offerings and fees. Hence, according to the general law, if a patient died in hospital after having acquired a quasi-domicile by residence there for more than six months, even though he had also a domicile in some other parish, the church of the parish in which the hospital is situated has the *jus funerandi*, and its clergy should be given the funeral offerings and fees. Nor is it a quite valid objection to urge that the offerings contemplated by general law are much smaller than those made on the occasion of funerals in the Armagh Province. The small offerings of the general law as well as the large offerings of the Armagh Province go to the maintenance of the clergy, and both are contributed by the friends of the deceased; hence, if it is not inequitable to put the two parishes on the same footing for the small offerings, we fail to see how it can be so for the large ones; the question of more or less does not affect the underlying principle, which is the same in both cases.

Again, under the old legislation, as we saw above, patients very rarely acquired a quasi-domicile in a hospital; and, consequently, so far as general law was concerned, the local clergy had not the *jus funerandi* nor the corresponding right to the funeral offerings and fees. Very frequently, however, the Holy See, by special privilege, conceded this right, especially in hospitals in large cities, thus indicating a consciousness of a certain amount of inconvenience and unfairness in the provisions of the general law. The following passage in the decision of

the Rota referred to already, illustrates very well the position in this matter:—

‘Potest tamen contingere, ut jus funerandi spectet ad capellanum, si quis sit, hospitalis, aut parochum loci ubi erectum est hospitalis, duplici ex capite, ex privilegio scilicet et ex consuetudine.

‘Privilegia exemptionis (docet Cardinalis de Luca, *De Parochis*, disc. xxiii. n. 12) merito per Sedem Apostolicam omnibus fere hospitalibus praesertim magnarum civitatum concessa sunt, tum ob cessantem rationem laboris et incommodi, ut supra (scilicet administrandi sacramenta), tum ob magnam confusionem alias resultantem circa sacramentorum administrationem, quum frequentius ex improvise et quacumque hora etiam de nocte oporteret, si pro singulis infirmis diversarum parochiarum etiam distantium convocare oporteret proprios parochos, quod esset impracticabile.’¹

The attitude of the Church, therefore, seems to have been that the position occupied by the clergy of the hospitals in virtue of general law was somewhat inequitable.

Finally, it was unquestioned in the Armagh Province, at least in the years which immediately preceded the Code, and is unquestioned now,² that the clergy of the old quasi-domicile and the clergy of the domicile should be equiparated, and that, consequently, if one who had a domicile and quasi-domicile of this kind dies in the parish of the quasi-domicile, its clergy has a right to all the offerings to the exclusion of the clergy of the domicile. Now, if this is not inequitable, and the general acquiescence in it permits of no other conclusion, we fail to see why it would be inequitable to equiparate the clergy of the new quasi-domicile with the clergy of the domicile. The requisite association between the pastor and his parishioner in the case of the new quasi-domicile is longer than in the case of the old, and is quite as stable. The new quasi-domicile, indeed, especially on account of hospitals, will play a part much more frequently in connexion with funeral offerings; but that fact, certainly, does not constitute a reason for placing it in an inferior position.

The arguments for the acceptance of *paroecia*, with its old denotation, which constitute the other part of his contribution, ‘Alter Dubius’ does not insist upon too strongly; he evidently does not regard them as fully demonstrative. Hence a few brief references to them will suffice. The appeal to the intention of the legislator, has been already sufficiently dealt with in our reply to ‘Mullaghduff.’ It will be enough here to insist again upon uselessness of such an appeal, seeing that, apart from the words of the law, there is no evidence that an interpreter can take cognizance of as to what this intention was; and hence it must be presumed to have been in harmony with the meaning of the words.

‘The fact, however, remains,’ says ‘Alter Dubius,’ ‘that they (the

¹ Loc. cit.

² ‘Alter Dubius’ himself expressly admits it, when he states the limited connotation of *paroecia* in pre-Code days supplied a proper basis of equity.

words) have been changed in their comprehensiveness by the publication of the Code, and if, as appears to be the case, they were designed in their original setting to crystallize the intention of the legislators, and in their then limited meaning to supply the most satisfactory basis of adjustment, is it imperative—and this in a pre-existing statute—that they should be toned up in practice to present-day extension, when such a thing would defeat, to some extent at least, the intention of the legislators and open the way to less equitable arrangements which it was their purpose to guard against ?

We fear that 'Alter Dubius' fails to envisage the real 'basis of adjustment' in the Armagh discipline—the fundamental factor in the allocation of funeral offerings—viz., the *paroecia propria* and the nexus between pastor and parishioner which it implies. If he remembers that those who reside for more than six months in a parish are now in a position completely different from that of pre-Code days, that now this parish is their *paroecia propria*, and that between its pastor and themselves the reciprocal rights and obligations of superior and subject arise, whereas formerly they were merely *vagi* or *peregrini* in a foreign territory, he will easily realize that the change in comprehensiveness does not involve the slightest change in the intention of the legislators as expressed in the law. The reference to the inequitableness of the new arrangements needs very little comment in addition to what has been already said on this point. 'Alter Dubius' explicitly admits that the limited connotation of the law in pre-Code days 'supplied a proper basis of equity.' Therefore, when a man who has a domicile in one parish and quasi-domicile acquired by residence—even of the briefest duration—and intention in another, dies in the latter, he must admit the equitableness of the arrangement giving all the offerings to the clergy of the quasi-domicile. If so, why in similar circumstances is it inequitable to give all the offerings to the clergy of the quasi-domicile acquired by residence for the greater part of the year ?

Canons 1234 and 1236 permit a good deal of local autonomy in the matter of *funeralia*, but the deduction of 'Alter Dubius' from this fact is fallacious. It is based on the assumption that, by the application of the new quasi-domicile, the 'original sense' and the 'traditionary interpretation' of the Armagh law have been changed. From what has been just said, it is evident that this assumption is incorrect: the *paroecia propria* and the nexus between pastor and parishioner implied by it remain still the 'basis of adjustment,' the fundamental factor in the allocation of offerings.

We quite agree that a man may have had several parishes at the time of his death; but we cannot admit that he can be said to have died outside his parish, if he has died in one of them, even in one that is his parish by reason of the quasi-domicile of residence; to our mind such a statement seems to be a contradiction in terms.¹ It must be remembered,

¹ Such a statement is clearly opposed to the Armagh law. If, for example, a man has two parishes by reason of a domicile in each, and dies in one of them, surely the other has not a right to three-fourths of the offerings.

too, that by Canon Law quasi-domicile counts for as much as domicile¹ in constituting a *paroecia propria*.

'Alter Dubius' says that he would be interested to know 'what is to be thought of one who, by reason of the previous election of the deceased, and without any further title except possession, takes his stand on the general law in the distribution of *oblata*.' To such a one we should say, first of all, that possession is not a title for offerings anywhere; and, secondly, that under the Armagh discipline, neither is the election of the deceased. That election is not a title is quite clear in the circumstances explicitly dealt with in the Armagh law. When a man dies outside his parish, no matter where he elects to have his funeral rites performed, one-fourth of the offerings go to the clergy of the place of death and three-fourths to the clergy of his parish. The law implies that it is not a title in other circumstances; because, if it were, one would be driven to the conclusion—absurd, in view of its explicit regulation—that when a man dies in his own parish, but elects to have his funeral rites performed in some other parish, three-fourths of the offerings should go to the clergy of the latter and only one-fourth to the clergy of his own parish. Besides, according to the prevailing practice, both before the Armagh law, as we have heard on reliable authority, and since its publication, as we know from our own experience, neither the election of the deceased nor the performance of the funeral rites have constituted a title for offerings.

CAN A BISHOP PERMIT A PARISH PRIEST TO TAKE A 'HONORARIUM' FOR A 'SECOND MASS' AND FOR A MASS ON A RETRENCHED HOLIDAY?

DEAR REV. SIR,—Be good enough to answer the following queries in the I. E. RECORD:—

1°. Can a Bishop give a parish priest permission to take a *honorarium* for a second Mass on Sundays?

2°. Can he dispense a parish priest from applying the Mass *pro populo* on retrenched holidays and allow him to take a *honorarium* for Mass on those days?

INQUIRER.

1°. The answer to the first query is in the negative. The presupposition, of course, is that the parish priest offers one of his Masses for the people in fulfilment of his pastoral obligation; and Canon 824, § 2, forbids the taking of a *honorarium* for the other Mass in circumstances of this kind. As far as we know, the Irish Bishops have not any special faculties in this matter.

2°. We dealt with this second query in the I. E. RECORD of last October. So far as general law is concerned, a Bishop cannot grant

¹ Cf. Canon 94.

such a dispensation¹; the Irish Bishops, however, can do so, in virtue of special faculties. These faculties, indeed, were received before the publication of the Code; but since the decree *Proxima*² did not affect them, they may still be utilized. Their latest renewal was for a period of ten years, and took place in January, 1916³; a copy of them may be found in the Appendix to the Maynooth Statutes, p. 11. In the words of the rescript itself the power must be exercised '*pro arbitrio et conscientia Episcoporum, qui tamen Apostolico Indulto utantur perpensis locorum et personarum adjunctis*'; and hence for its valid and lawful use, just as in the case of all other delegated jurisdiction, a reasonable cause is required.

J. KINANE.

LITURGY

TRANSFER OF THE OUTWARD SOLEMNITY ATTACHING TO THE CELEBRATION OF THE FEAST OF THE PATRON

REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you kindly enlighten me in the following difficulty? It has reference to the transfer of local Feasts from week-days to Sundays, as prescribed by the New Code.

St. B—— is the Patron of this diocese and the special Patron of this parish, where he is said to have been buried. For very many years it has been the custom to honour his Feast in a special way on the day of the week on which it occurs. At present we honour it by a Triduum of preparation before it; on the Feast itself we usually have a Solemn High Mass, a sermon and Benediction. These devotions are well attended. In this district of the parish it is kept as a local holiday, with shops closed and no servile work. Still I feel they do not look upon the obligation of the holiday as strict. Should I, under such circumstances, change the Feast to Sunday, and, if so, to which Sunday, and how am I to act in the case? If the matter has been already treated in the I. E. RECORD it will do to refer me to the place.

PAROCHUS.

The canon of the Code to which our correspondent refers is, presumably, Canon 1247, § 2. It reads: '*Ecclesiastico praecepto dies festi Patronorum non subjacent; locorum autem Ordinarii possunt solemnitatem exteriorem transferre ad dominicam proximam sequentem.*' The Feast of a Patron as such is therefore no longer subject to the ecclesiastical precept of hearing Mass and abstaining from servile work, no matter what the custom to the contrary, and the external solemnity

¹ Cf. Canon 466.

² *Acta Ap. Sedis*, June, 1918, p. 190.

³ Vide *I. T. Quarterly*, April, 1916.

of such a Feast *may* be transferred by the Ordinary to the following Sunday. The external solemnity of a Feast has a definite meaning, and it is not within the competency of a parish priest to effect its transference without reference to the Ordinary of the diocese. It is for the Ordinary to decide, taking all the circumstances into account, whether the external solemnity associated with the celebration of the Feast of the Patron shall appertain to the day of the Feast or be transferred to the following Sunday, and the privileges attaching to this external solemnity can only be availed of when the transference has been duly effected. It is not true to say that the New Code prescribes that such a transference *should be* ¹ made, but it is true that for validity two conditions are required, viz., (1) that it be done with the sanction of the Ordinary, and (2) that the solemnity be assigned to the Sunday immediately following the Feast. By the external solemnity in this connexion we are to understand primarily (*a*) the Solemn or sung Mass of the Feast, and (*b*) the private Masses of the same, as far as the rubrics permit. The chanting of Solemn Vespers,² the sermon, Procession, and Benediction, though doubtless entering into the external solemnity of the Feast, are not essential, and may or may not be added, according to circumstances. Granted, then, that the transference has been duly authorized, the next question is how far may this privilege of celebrating the solemn Mass and private Masses of the Feast be availed of on the Sunday? The new rubrics³ distinguish two classes of external solemnity varying according to the quality of the Feast. To the first class belong the Feasts of the Patron, Titular, Founder, and Dedication; to the second, those Feasts which were formerly assigned definitely to certain Sundays of the year. The solemnity of the Patron, as belonging to the first class, may be celebrated in churches, public and semi-public oratories, and the extent of the celebration will depend on the character of the Sunday to which it is transferred.

(1) If it is a Minor Sunday, and a double of the 1st class does not occur, there may be a solemn or sung Mass of the Feast and *one* read or Low Mass. With regard to the commemorations in this Mass, the following rule* of the Sacred Congregation still applies: 'Omnes missae de Solemnitatibus in Dominica celebratis semper dicantur ut in ipso Festo de quo agitur Sollemnitas, addita oratione de officio diei et aliis omnibus quae dicendae essent, si Festum ipsa Dominica incidisset.' There will be commemorations, therefore, of the Sunday, of privileged octaves and of Double Feasts of 2nd class, if they should occur on that day.

¹ Similarly the decree of the Sacred Congregation, 12 February, 1916, states that 'the external solemnity can be celebrated on the Sunday, but need not be.'

² The Vespers of the transferred solemnity are only permitted, 'devotionis gratia,' and therefore those who are bound to the Office must recite privately the Vespers of the day, even though they attend the Solemn Vespers in choir. Cf. Decr. 3365 ad 10; 3441, 3450.

³ Cf. Tit. iv. n. 3, Nov. Rub.

⁴ Decr. 28 October, 1913.

(2) If the Sunday to which the external solemnity is transferred be a Major Sunday (i.e., of Advent or from Septuagesima to Easter), or if a double of the 1st class happens to fall on it, the festive Mass may not be either sung or read, but the Prayer of the transferred solemnity is added under one conclusion to the principal Prayer of the Mass. If, however, the Sunday happens to be the Feast of Easter, Pentecost, Trinity, Nativity, or Epiphany, not even this Prayer of the transferred solemnity is allowed, and all mention of it for that year is omitted in the Mass.

REQUIEM MASS ON ASH WEDNESDAY AND ON A SUNDAY. PECULIAR CEREMONY IN CONNEXION WITH A MISSION

REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you kindly give space to the enclosed queries in the I. E. RECORD, and offer an opinion on their merits:—

1°. Visiting a parish church in this diocese on Ash Wednesday, I was surprised to see the officiating priest first bless and distribute the Ashes in purple cope, and then vest in black and say Requiem Mass for a parishioner, who was being buried from the church that morning. There was no other Mass offered in the church. On what grounds could the Mass of this privileged feria be omitted, or what is to be said for the action of the priest on the occasion?

2°. May a Requiem Low Mass be celebrated on a Sunday, 'presente corpore,' at the hour of the principal public Mass of the day? In the case I have before my mind a very great number of the people were taken by surprise, and technically lost Mass because of the omission of the usual Asperges, Acts and Prayer, etc., before this public Mass.

3°. During a Mission in this parish one night was set apart for the Consecration of the parishioners to the Immaculate Mother of God. A very elaborate altar, with flowers and candles, was erected *in front* of the High Altar around the specially enthroned statue of the Blessed Virgin. On this altar were about 200 lights, while the High Altar had about 30. Benediction of the Most Holy Sacrament was to succeed the Act of Consecration, and the missionary Father requested that the lights on the temporary altar were to be left lighting during the Exposition, explaining that his Order had a special privilege for this ceremony. Could such a privilege be granted? I am aware of decrees of the Sacred Congregation bearing on lights on side-altars during Exposition, but I have read of nothing to sanction such a practice as this.

SACERDOS.

1° and 2°. The answer to the first and second queries is sufficiently contained in the following excerpt from the rubrics of the new Missal

(Tit. iii. n. 12): 'Quaelibet tamen Missa Defunctorum *etiam in die aut pro die obitus*, et in ecclesii subi habeatur expositio Ss̃mi Sacramenti, prohibetur toto expositionis tempore, praeter quam Missae de Commemoratione Omnium Fidelium Defunctorum. Prohibetur insuper quoties urgeat obligatio Missae cujuslibet conventualis vel *parochialis*, cui per alios Sacerdotes satisfieri nequeat, item in ecclesiis unam tantum Missam habentibus prohibetur die 2 Februarii, *Feria IV Cinerum*, Dominica Palmarum et in Vigilia Pentecostes, si respective fiat benedictio Candelarum, *Cinerum*, Palmarum aut Fontis Baptismalis et in Litanis majoribus et minoribus, si fiat Processio.'¹ It is not permitted, therefore, to have an Exequial Mass on a Sunday in place of the principal parochial Mass, nor is it lawful to have an Exequial Mass at all on Ash Wednesday, in a church where the sacred ashes are blessed and only one Mass is said. Further comment on the clear statement of the rubric is superfluous.

3°. The ceremony as described by our correspondent is unusual, and we should be surprised to learn that it had official sanction of any kind whatsoever. It would seem a manifest deordination to have a Lady's Altar, with an enthroned statue of the Blessed Virgin and an abundance of lights and flowers, erected *in front* of the Altar of the Blessed Sacrament. It is right, of course, that the ceremony of Consecration to the Immaculate Mother should be carried out with all due solemnity, but where is the necessity or justification for erecting the altar in that particular place? If an altar is to be decorated for the occasion, why not use the Blessed Virgin's Altar proper, or have a temporary altar erected at the side? There is no enactment of the Sacred Congregation dealing with a matter of this kind, nor will you find it discussed by any liturgical authority. Personally, we imagine that the impropriety of it is so manifest that it does not call for discussion. Again, while there is no serious objection to having lights on side-altars or before shrines during Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, provided always that the lights on the Altar of Exposition predominate, there is a decided objection when, as in this instance, the proviso is ignored. By an onlooker of the Benediction Service on such an occasion the enthroned statue of the Blessed Virgin might easily be taken to be the central object of worship. 'Cavendum,' says Van der Stappen ² 'ne per majorem ornatum aut luminum copiam principalis et major veneratio statuis aut imaginibus pictis exhibeatur et SS. Sacramentum quasi objectum minus principale habeatur.' But our correspondent may have misunderstood the statement of the missionary Father. It is one thing to say that you have the privilege of performing a particular ceremony and quite another that you have the privilege of performing it after the manner described. If the latter is asserted we should be interested to see the terms of the privilege.

¹ The italics are ours.

² Tom. iv. p. 151.

OBLIGATION OF THE ABSOLUTION 'SUPER TUMULUM.' A RUBRIC OF BAPTISM

REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you kindly answer the following queries in the coming issue of the I. E. RECORD:—

1°. Is it correct to say, as Fortescue does at page 135, note 1 (*Ceremonies of the Roman Rite*), that there is no law 'that absolution at the catafalque must follow a Requiem Mass'? The decision of the Congregation given there seems to refer only to Anniversaries. What about Office and Requiem Mass on the 3rd, 7th, and 30th days? Is the Absolution on those days optional or obligatory?

2°. At page 395, Dr. Fortescue says: 'The water may best be poured over the right cheek.' What is your opinion regarding this manner of baptizing on the cheek? According to O'Kane's *Rubrics of the Roman Ritual* (new edition), page 145, the water is best poured on the forehead in certain circumstances.

QUAESITOR.

1°. According to the Ritual, when the corpse is physically or morally present, the Absolution should never be omitted after an Exequial Mass. This appears from Tit. vi. cap. 3, nn. 16, 17, where, after stating that in case of necessity the Requiem Office may be omitted, the Ritual says, 'aliae praedictae preces et suffragia nunquam omittantur.' The same inference is deducible from the actual description of the rite of Absolution where the direction is given that it is to follow the Mass: 'Finita Missa sacerdos deposita casula,' etc. (Tit. vi. cap. 3, n. 7). When the corpse is only morally present, i.e., when by civil edict, or owing to contagious disease or any other grave cause, it cannot be physically present, the Absolution should be performed over the catafalque just as if the body were actually present.¹ With regard to the services on the 3rd, 7th, and 30th days after death and anniversary days, there is no rubric of either the Ritual or Missal prescribing that the Absolution should follow the Mass, nor has there been any ruling to that effect by the Sacred Congregation. The rubric of the Missal, 'Finita Missa si facienda est absolutio,' clearly indicates that it is optional, and the decision² of the Sacred Congregation, stating explicitly that this is so in case of Anniversaries, may reasonably be taken as applying to all such Masses. The same reasons 'ceteris paribus' for allowing an option in the matter, apply equally to all. An obligation, however, may arise from justice, either because of the terms of the foundation or of the expressed wish or order of the giver of the *honorarium*,³ or because of a custom prevailing in the particular church.

¹ Deer. 3767 ad 26.

² Deer. 1322 ad 6.

³ Deer. 3369 ad 2. Cf. De Herdt, tom. iii. p. 220; Van der Stappen, tom. iv. p. 27.

The answer, therefore, to our correspondent is (1) that Dr. Fortescue's statement is true except on the occasion of an Exequial Mass '*corpore moraliter presente*'; (2) that, as far as the rubrics of the Ritual and Missal and the ruling of the Sacred Congregation are concerned, the Absolution on the occasions mentioned is optional.

2°. We suppose Dr. Fortescue is as much entitled to his opinion as the editor of O'Kane as to the best method of pouring the water on the head of the child. The rubric of the Ritual merely says, '*ter fundit super caput infantis in modum crucis.*' The older rubricists, and indeed many of the older Rituals, prescribed that the water should be poured on the crown of the head, giving the additional instruction, '*si infans sit capillatus sacerdos digitis sinistræ manus cæsariem ejus discriminat dum dextra aquam infundit.*' While we believe it is perfectly valid and lawful to baptize on the forehead or on the right cheek in all cases, we see no reason to depart from the traditional method of baptizing on the crown of the head, holding the child's face downwards; nor are we satisfied that either of the two other ways suggested is an improvement on it.

P.S.—We would kindly refer 'C.C.,' who recently sent us queries regarding (1) the liceity of reversible vestments, and (2) the insertion of the '*Oratio imperata*' in place of the Prayer '*Ad libitum*' in Sunday Masses, to the I. E. RECORD, March, 1920, p. 249, and February, 1922, p. 204, where he will find our views on these points given in answer to other correspondents.

M. EATON.

DOCUMENTS

ORATION ON THE ELECTION OF A SUPREME PONTIFF DELIVERED BY R. P. AURELIO GALLI AFTER THE MASS OF THE HOLY GHOST PREPARATORY TO THE RECENT CONCLAVE

(February 2, 1922)

Oratio autem de eligendo Summo Pontifice post absolutam Missam a R. P. D. Aurelio Galli, litteris Apostolicis ad Principes scribendis Secretario, habita haec est :

ORATIO DE ELIGENDO PONTIFICE

Cum, abhinc annis vix septem, ex hoc ipso suggestu ad vos, eminentissimi Patres, de Pontifice Maximo eligendo orationem habuissem, sane nihil minus putabam hoc intervallo futurum, quam ut iterum de ea gravissima causa, iussu mandatuque vestro, vos alloqui deberem, praesertim cum parens ille catholici nominis meritissimus, quem ereptum dolemus, spem bonam certamque nobis faceret diuturni principatus. Sed arcana Dei consilia veneremur, qui fidelem servum et prudentem uti praeter opinionem super familiam suam constituerat, ita contra expectationem ad aeterna meritorum praemia in caelum evocavit. Nunc igitur vestrum erit designare eum, cui Deus ipse Ecclesiae sanctae gubernacula committat. Profecto, maximum omnium onus ac munus semper fuit rei christianae praeesse; id vero numquam fortasse tantum habuit, quantum hoc tempore, difficultatis. Benedicti quidem Pontificatus incidit in tempestatem post natos homines turbulentissimam, siquidem teterrimo bello flagrabat orbis terrarum: at, qui eum excepturus est, is rerum condicionem inveniet non multo tranquillior. Nam si eiusmodi incendium iam restinctum est, adhuc tamen eius reliquiae fumant passim minacissimae ex ingentibus, quae exstant in omni genere, ruinis. Itaque exoptatae pacis ut homines, iuvante Deo, faciat compotes, videntur in primis fore illius partes, quem in augusta Petri Cathedra vestris suffragiis locaveritis. Qui quidem qualis vir debeat, esse, ut et celsissimae dignitati et populi christiani votis respondeat, vos, eminentissimi Patres, religiose vobiscum considerabitis. Interea sinite, ut quae in eo praecipue requiri hodie videantur, ego, vestrae voluntati obsecutus, paucis expediam.

Si quis diligenter mala intueatur quibus iam dudum laborat humana societas, agnoscat in eis necesse est non tam communem sortem mortalis vitae, doloribus aerumnisque obnoxiae, quam scelorum vindicem iram Dei, homines a se abalienatos misericordii consilio verberantis,

ut revocet ad sanitatem. Nulla enimvero aetas a bellorum horrore vacavit, quandoquidem effrenatae animi cupiditates semper ad aliorum iura violanda homines impulerunt. Sed bellum recens, quale bellum nulla barbaria gesserat, tam immensum, tam crudele, tam diuturnum, non dubie indicavit, homines magnam partem de via declinasse, suspicere in caelum bonaque immortalia appetere desivisse, et omnes cogitationes suas abiecisse in terram. Itaque eius contentionis insaniam tam multae tamque magnae sunt et comitatae et consecutae miseriae ut nec maiores umquam neque plures in genus humanum invaserint. Eas vero cernimus ibi maxime exstitisse, ubi omnis religionis contemptu constituta esset, tamquam fundamento, respublica. Quoniam autem qui communi existimatione florere solent, naturalium rerum scientia plus aequo confisi, quaecumque fidei supernaturalis sunt, superbe aspernari consueverant, non sine Dei nutu factum est, ut homines ipsam scientiam in suum ipsorum interitum converterent, atque intelligerent experiendo contumaces elatosque spiritus in divinam maiestatem cum pernicie exitioque sui esse coniunctos.

Resedit tandem derepente ille aestus internecivi belli et quidem Dei miserentis beneficio resedit. Num tantae calamitatis perpassio humano generi fuit, quemadmodum sperari licuerat, documento? Num aliqua facta est privatim publice aut in nationum inter nationes commercio emendatio disciplinae? Mutuas etiam nunc similitudines exercent populi quos inter bellum fuit; et alteri quidem omnes intendunt nervos ad ea quae armis quaesita sunt, retinenda, alteri ad eadem aliquando posthac recuperanda. Quod si civitates inter se a caedibus et vastationibus abstinent, at cives civibus, ordines ordinibus adeo reddunt studia partium infestos, ut fere cotidie hostiles incursiones et funesta latrocinia fiant. Praeterea, inflammata bello, cupido delicate molliterque vivendi latissime mores depravavit; cuius rei argumento est, quod feminarum pleraeque tali cum ornatu iam solent prodire in publicum ut nativam verecundiam plane exuisse videantur. Hinc, praeceuntibus exemplo iis qui, cum quaestui bellum haberent, ex tenui fortuna ad maximas copias subito pervenerunt, ingens pecuniarum in res inanes et voluptarias profusio increbrescit; quae quidem nimium quantum confert ad rationes civitatum perturbandas, praesertim quia, late fusa aviditate habendi, tamen laboris et operae fastidium incessit multitudini.

Haec omnia profecto sunt eiusmodi quae, cum humanae societatis grave tempus declarent, tum etiam graviora portentant. Itaque videmus, quanto studio qui civitatibus praesunt, orbis terrarum res et politicas et oeconomicas nitantur componere, sed simul quam exiguo cum fructu. Nam his quattuor fere annis pluries plurifariam ob eam nobilissimam causam in unum convenerunt; necdum tamen pacem optatissimam mundo adfuturam spes ostenditur. Etenim bella sibi ipsi parere homines possunt; pacem veri nominis, nisi Deo adiuvante, non possunt. Siquidem nulla alia re pax continetur nisi ordinis tranquillitate; quo ordo omnino postulat, ut humana omnia, rerum auctori et conservatori Deo subsint eiusque legibus pareant. Cum igitur populi, iustitiam violantes caritatemque mutuum, in quibus divinarum legum summa consistit, acerba

contentione inter se confecerint, si volent in pacis possessionem restitui, prorsus necesse est, ut a Deo et veniam rogent paenitendo, et ad plagas, quas ipsi sibi fecerint, curandas auxilium implorent. Et vere, ut verbis utar desideratissimi Patris, quem nuper amisimus, 'has tantas misérias contemplanti quibus premitur humanum genus, sponte venit in mentem viator ille evangelicus, qui descendens ab Ierusalem in Iericho, incidit in latrones, a quibus despoliatus, plagisque impositis, est semivivus relictus. Magna enim est inter utrumque similitudo; et quemadmodum ad illum misericordia motus, Samaritanus accessit, qui, alligatis vulneribus, infusoque oleo et vino, duxit eum in stabulum, et curam eius egit; ita ad sananda humanae societatis vulnera manum suam adhibeat oportet Iesus Christus, cuius quidem Samaritanus ille personam sustinebat.'¹ Ipse est qui, profuso in pretium suo Sanguine, mundi salutem in aeternum comparavit: *Et non est in alio aliquo salus. Nec enim aliud nomen est sub caelo datum hominibus in quo oporteat nos salvos fieri*²: hominibus, inquam, non singulis tantum, sed etiam populis, et iis universis. Iamvero Christus Dominus perpetuo ad salvandum genus humanum operam adhibet Ecclesiae, Sponsae suae, atque eo maxime utitur administro, qui suam vicem gerit in terris Romanus Pontifex.

Videtur igitur, eminentissimi Patres, quantum intersit, hoc tam necessario tempore, ut is quem vos designaturi estis Iesu Christi Vicarium, omnibus quidem et mentis et animi virtutibus eluceat, sed abundet ante omnia misericordia et caritate Christi. Qui, si coram esuriente multitudine penitus ad benignitatem commoveri visus est ut diceret *misereor super turbam*, quanto cum miserationis sensu aspicere nunc debet hominum universitatem in tot miseriis et doloribus iacentem! Praesertim 'quacumque pervagatus est bellicus furor, immensi terrarum tractus obiiiciuntur ubi solitudo et vastitas, ubi inculta et relicta omnia; redactae usque eo plebes ut victu, vestitu tectisque ipsis careant; viduae orphanique innumerabiles, qui cuiuslibet opis indigent; incredibilis multitudo debiliū, infantium potissimum ac puerorum in affectis corporibus testantium belli recentis atrocitatem.' Quare infinitus prope campus patebit novo Pontifici, ubi, divini Cordis interpres, multiformem suam caritatem exerceat, simul ipse largiter tot necessitatibus, pro sua facultate, succurrens, simul bonorum omnium opes ad succurrendum sollicitè advocans.

Nec vero haec solum mala corporum et externa Pontificem postulant plenum alacritatis ad medendum, sed illa etiam, et multo magis, quae ad mores et instituta pertinent. Aegrotat enim, uti dixi, funditus humana societas atque omnibus eius partibus oportet salutarem Christi virtutem Christi Vicarius admoveat. Principio diligentem det operam reconciliandis inter se tum civium ordinibus tum civitatibus, nec finem faciat id hortandi, antequam sanctum omnes habeant fraterno ritu inter se diligere, cum ab eodem conditore Deo profecti eodemque divino sanguine redempti ad eadem potiunda aeterna bona destinentur.

¹ Epist. Encycl. *Pacem, Dei munus.*

² Act. IV, 12.

Sed enim homines idcirco immortalia illa negligunt acerrimeque de fluxarum rerum possessione contendunt, quod apud plerosque summa est ignoratio christianae doctrinae et naturalismi, qui dicitur, omnibus blandientis cupiditatibus, solum praecepta valent. Scilicet haec est labes horum temporum maxima, hic quasi fons omnium, quibus premimur, malorum, quod veritate, quam Iesus Christus nobis attulit, non alitur, non illustratur, quoad oportet, genus humanum; hoc tamquam cibo destitutae, miserabiliter tot animae tabescunt, hac tamquam luce carentes, per offusas errorum tenebras ad interitum ruunt sempiternum. Itaque omnino Ecclesiae opus est tali Pontifice, qui, studio animarum incensus, omni ope atque opera nitatur christianam sapientiam usquequaque diffundere. Isque etiam prudentia homines gubernandi usuque rerum polleat oportebit: quare ad officium quod sibi maxime in Petro impositum est, docendi omnes gentes, rite exsequendum, omnium quos par sit adiutores ei participesque esse sanctissimi muneris, studia incitabit. Praecipuam igitur quamdam curarum partem clero tribuet eique paterna cum vigilantia aderit ad moderandum, ad commonendum, ad cohortandum. Sacrae vero instituendae iuventuti, utpote quae maximas spes Ecclesiae sanctae contineat, peculiarem omnino diligentiam impertiet, ideo nimirum ut, cum bene omnibus rebus instructa evadat ad divinum ministerium, tum praesertim *potens sit exhortari in doctrina sana, et eos qui contradicunt arguere*.¹

Ipse autem, quod ad praeconium tutelamque veritatis attinet, negligendos sane non putabit bonos doctosque laicos, qui quidem egregiam operam clero navare possunt cum alio pacto, tum cotidiana ac periodica, ut aiunt, scripta vulgando. Incredibilis est enim huiusmodi scriptionum vis in utramque partem, cum ab iis legendis raro inveniatur qui sese absterneat, ad easque populus opiniones suas conformare consueverit. Quare efficiendum est, ut ad eos christiana sapientia hoc saltem instrumento perveniat, qui eam ex ore sacerdotis exquirere ipsi non solent. Ceterum, scriptores catholici, qui ad tantum munus assumuntur, curandum erit ut illud, diligenti adhibita praeparatione, adeant, idemque sancte pro dignitate gerant.

Iam illud quoque attendendum vobis est, eminentissimi Patres, diligenter: saeviente bello, cum in dies exeresceret egentium numerus, abundantes opibus acatholici homines praesto nostris fuere, specie quidem ut eorum necessitatibus liberaliter subvenirent, re autem ut de materno Ecclesiae gremio eos abstraherent. Qui perseverant adhuc in regionibus catholicorum pervagari ad haereticae pravitatis luem disseminandam; atque utinam res eis non succederet ob eam, quam pervulgatam dixi—coniunctam inopiae—inscitiam religionis. Nec vero id solum agunt, acrius quidem quam antea, ut Ecclesiam catholicam in suis ipsius finibus oppugnent, sed etiam multimodis impediunt, ne apud barbaros amplius sua tentoria dilatet, cum missiones catholicae magnas bello iacturas fecerint tum apostolicorum hominum tum facultatum, ipsi autem praesidiis omnis generis affluant. Huic rei domi forisque tam incommodae

¹ *Ad Tit., I, 9.*

ut occurratis, intelligitis, eminentissimi Patres, eligendum vobis esse Pontificem in quo insignis ardor sit ad regnum Iesu Christi vel confirmandum vel amplificandum, quique omnibus quotquot sunt, filiis Ecclesiae perstudiosis persuadeat, velint sibi opera, prece, re esse adiumento, ut plebem christianam in avita fide retinere possit lateque christianum nomen propagare.

Ego vero sentio me hactenus, cum adumbrare studerem Pontificem novum, qualis videretur esse debere, ea, quae ipse Benedictus XV gesserit, summam attigisse. Nam quis ad dolores populorum consolandos eo plenior misericordiae ac sollicitudinis? Quis ad necessitates inopum sublevandas beneficentior? Quis in pace gentibus suadenda aut in earum sedandis inimicitias instantior? Quis autem studiosius unquam curavit, ut christianae doctrinae pabulo aleretur popularis pietas atque ipsius Evangelii lectione calesceret? Cui etiam maximae curae fuit catholicae fidei et integritatem tueri in nostris et fovere apud ethnicos incrementa. Quod si aliquid ex iis quae, communis salutis causâ, susceperat, non prosperum successum habuit, magna tamen eius laus est id summa contentione esse conatum. Itaque vulgatissima prudentium opinio est, necessitate quadam fore, ut qui mox ad Ecclesiae catholicae gubernaculum sedebit, is non alia via cursum dirigat, nisi qua Benedictus direxerit, tanto cum emolumento apostolicae auctoritatis.

Iam vobis communiter consultantibus, Patres eminentissimi, magnis Ecclesiae universae precibus exoratus, adsit Spiritus Sanctus, auspice et patrona Maria Virgine Deipara, quae vobis ex hac imagine suavissime arridet *Mater Boni Consilii*. Vos vero Ecclesiae, maximum suum Pastorem et Magistrum desideranti, praeclare satisfacturos putate, si, pro vestra sapientia et sacrosancti conscientia officii, eum in beati Petri Cathedra Pontificem constituatis, in quo Benedicti XV, praeter cetera virtutum ornamenta, patiens, benigna, actiosa, prudens caritas revixisse videatur.

THE ELECTION OF THE SUPREME PONTIFF PIUS XI

(February 6, 1922)

ELECTIO SUMMI PONTIFICIS

Tribus itaque integris diebus 3a, 4a et 5a februarii 1922 consultationes et scrutinia Patrum perduravere: tandem die 6a mensis, quae fuit feria secunda hebdomadae ante Septuagesimam, feliciter in Summum Pontificem electus est Eñus ac Rñus Dñus Cardinalis ACHILLES RATTI, qui Eñno Cardinali Decano, nomine totius Sacri Collegii, requirenti 'Acceptasne electionem de te canonice factam in Summum Pontificem,' affirmative respondit. Eidemque iterum percontanti: 'Quomodo vis vocari,' respondit: Pius XI.

De hisce rebus faustissime gestis, illico R. P. D. Praefectus Caeremoniarum Apostolicarum idemque Protonotarius Apostolicus, Carolus Respighi, instrumentum redegit in hanc formam:

ACTUS ACCEPTATIONIS SUMMI PONTIFICATUS

In nomine Domini. Amen.

Ego Carolus Respighi, Protonotarius Apostolicus et Sanctae Sedis Caeremoniarum Praefectus ex officio rogatus, attestor et omnibus notum facio Eminentissimum et Reverendissimum Dominum ACHILLEM titulo Ss. Silvestri et Martini in Montibus S. R. E. Presbyterum Cardinalem RATTI, Archiepiscopum Mediolanensem, accepisse electionem canonicè de Se factam in Summum Pontificem, Sibique nomen imposuisse: 'PIUS DECIMUS PRIMUS,' ut de hoc publica quaecumque instrumenta confici possint.

Acta haec sunt in Conclavi post obitum fel. rec. Benedicti PP. XV, hac die sexta mensis februarii anno Domini MCMXXII, testibus adhibitis atque rogatis, Rm̃o Dño Aloisio Sincero Sacri Collegii Secretario et Rm̃is DD. Iosepho Tani et Ioanne Baptista Menghini, Apostolicarum Caeremoniarum Magistris.

ALOISIUS SINCERO, *a Secretis S. Collegii.*

IOSEPH TANI, *Apost. Caerem. Magister.*

IOANNES BAPT. MENGhini, *Apost. Caerem. Magister.*

CAROLUS RESPIGHI,

Protonotarius Apostolicus, Caerem. Apost. Praefectus.

Papali veste iuxta morem indutus, statim Pontifex apostolicam impertivit benedictionem Eñis Cardinalibus, eorumque prima excepit obsequia, vulgo *adorationem*.

Postea Eñus Cardinalis Decanus, Magistris Caeremoniarum comitantibus, anulum piscatorium digito induxit Pontificis, qui illum Praefecto Caeremoniarum tradidit, ad nomen in eo Suum inculpandum.

PROMULGATIO

Interea populo exspectanti, e superiore porticu Basilicae Vaticanae laetissimum praeconium dabat Eñus Cardinalis Caietanus Bisleti, Diaconorum prior:

ANNUNTIO VOBIS GAUDIUM MAGNUM, HABEMUS PAPAM EMINENTISSIMUM ET REVERENDISSIMUM DOMINUM ACHILLEM RATTI, QUI SIBI NOMEN IMPOSUIT: PIUS XI.

Immensus inde plausus multitudinis eo vel magis invaluit cum rescitum est mox Pontificem ex eodem loco primam Apostolicam Benedictionem populo esse impertiturum. Ac revera paulo post Summus Pontifex e fenestra porticus in forum prospicienti apparuit, omnibus vehementer conclamantibus. Ubi vero turba intenta conticuit, Pius PP. XI elata firmaque voce benedictionem iuxta Caeremoniale Romanum sollemniter impertivit, et populum laeta acclamatione plaudentem peramanter iterum atque iterum salutavit, antequam in suas se conferret aedes.

Significatum porro ex officio est, per ministerium Excñi Mareschalli Conclavis, Summum Pontificem, hanc primam Benedictionem ad cunctas quotquot sunt gentes et civitates extendisse Animo Suo, tamquam praenuntiam et auspicem universalis exoptatae pacificationis.

TABLE OF THE CHIEF EVENTS IN THE LIFE OF OUR PRESENT HOLY FATHER PIUS XI

('Acta Apost. Sedis,' Feb. 1922, n. 5, p. 142.)

SSMI DOMINI NOSTRI PII PP. XI

CURRICULUM VITAE

Natus in oppido <i>Désio</i> archid. Mediolanensis . . .	die 31	maii	1857
Sacerdotio auctus Romae	die 20	decembris	1879
In Doctores Bibliothecae Ambrosianae adscitus Mediolani		mense novembri	1888
Eiusdem Bibliothecae Praeses electus	mense	martio	1907
Praelatus Domesticus renunciatus	die 6	martii	1907
Praeses Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanæ	die 1	septembris	1914
Canonicus patriarchalis Basilicæ Vaticanæ	die 14	„	1914
Protonotarius Apostolicus supra numerum	die 28	octobris	1914
Deputatus in Visitatorem Apostolicum Poloniae et finitimarum regionum	die 25	aprilis	1918
Nuntius Sedis Apostolicæ in Polonia	die 6	iunii	1919
Archiepiscopus Naupactensis publicatus in Con- sistorio	die 3	iulii	1919
— Consecratus Varsaviae	die 28	octobris	1919
Archiepiscopus Adanensis	die 19	aprilis	1921
S. R. E. Cardinalis tit. Ss. Silvestri et Martini in Montibus creatus et publicatus in Consistorio	die 13	iunii	1921
Archiepiscopus Mediolanensis	die 13	„	1921
Ad Summum Pontificatum electus	die 6	februarii	1922
Solemniter coronatus	die 12	„	1922

APOSTOLIC INDULGENCES GRANTED BY PIUS XI ON THE 17th FEBRUARY, 1922

SACRA POENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA INDULGENTIAE APOSTOLICAE

QUAS SSMUS D. N. PIUS PP. XI IN AUDIENTIA D. CARD. MAIORI POENI-
TENTARIO IMPERTITA DIE 17 FEBRUARII 1922 LARGITUS EST

Monita

1. Res aptae ad recipiendam benedictionem pro Indulgentiis Apostolicis lucrandis sunt tantummodo coronae, rosaria, cruces, crucifixi, parvae statuæ, numismata, dummodo non sint ex stanno, plumbo, vitro aliave simili materia, quae facile confringi vel consumi possit.

2. Imagines Sanctorum alios ne repraesentent quam rite canonizatos vel in probatis martyrologiis relatos.

3. Ut quis valeat Indulgentias Apostolicas lucrari necesse est ut aliquam ex rebus benedictis ab ipso Summo Pontifice, vel a sacerdote facultate praedito, super se deferat aut in domo sua decenter retineat.

4. Ex expressa SS. Domini nostri declaratione, per Apostolicarum Indulgentiarum concessionem nullatenus derogatur Indulgentiis a Summis Pontificibus iam alias forte concessis pro precibus, piis exercitiis vel operibus infra recensendis.

Indulgentiae

1. Quisquis saltem semel in hebdomada recitare consueverit coronam Dominicam, vel aliquam ex coronis B. Mariae Virginis, vel rosarium aut saltem eius tertiam partem, vel divinum officium, vel officium parvum eiusdem B. Mariae Virginis, vel integrum officium Defunctorum aut saltem vespervas aut nocturnum cum laudibus, vel psalmos poenitentiales aut graduales, vel consueverit in ecclesia christianam catechesim tradere, aut domi illam suos filios, propinquos vel famulos docere, vel in carceribus detentos aut aegrotantes in nosoconiis misericorditer invisere, vel pauperibus quomodocumque opitulari, vel Missae interesse eamve, si fuerit sacerdos, celebrare, servatis solitis conditionibus confessionis sacramentalis, sanctae Communionis et alicuius orationis ad mentem Summi Pontificis, lucrabitur Indulgentiam plenariam diebus Nativitatis Domini, Epiphaniae, Resurrectionis, Ascensionis, Pentecostes, SS. Trinitatis, Corporis Domini eiusdemque SS. Cordis; Purificationis, Annuntiationis, Assumptionis, Nativitatis et Immaculae Conceptionis B. Mariae Virginis; Nativitatis S. Ioannis Baptistae; utriusque festi S. Ioseph Sponsi B. Mariae Virginis; Ss. Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, Andreae, Iacobi, Ioannis, Thomae, Philippi et Iacobi, Bartholomaei, Matthaei, Simonis et Iudae, Matthiae, atque Omnium Sanctorum.

2. Si quis vero ad sacramentalem confessionem ac ad sanctam Communionem minime accesserit, corde tamen contritus ad mentem Summi Pontificis aliquantisper precatus fuerit, singulis diebus supra recensitis necnon aliis festis Domini et B. Mariae Virginis, Indulgentiam lucrabitur septem annorum totidemque quadragenarum; diebus Dominicis ceterisque per annum festis de praecepto, Indulgentiam quinque annorum totidemque quadragenarum; quovis, demum, alio anni die, Indulgentiam trecentorum dierum.

3. Insuper quisquis, aliquod ex praedictis pietatis vel charitatis operibus expleverit, quoties id peregerit, quingentorum dierum Indulgentiam acquirat.

4. Quisquis ad aeris campani signum sive mane, sive meridie, sive vespere orationem vulgo *Angelus Domini*, tempore autem paschali *Regina caeli*, aut, eas ignorans, semel *Pater noster* cum *Ave Maria*; itemque sub primam noctis horam, edito pro Defunctorum suffragio campanae signo, psalmum *De profundis* vel, si eum nesciat, *Pater noster* cum *Ave Maria* recitaverit, acquirat Indulgentiam centum dierum.

5. Eandem Indulgentiam acquirat qui quavis feria sexta de Passione et morte D. N. Iesu Christi aliquantulum pie cogitaverit terque Orationem Dominicam et Salutationem Angelicam devote recitaverit.

6. Qui suam conscientiam excusserit et peccata sua sincere detectus fuerit cum proposito se emendandi, devoteque recitaverit *Pater*

noster, Ave Maria et Gloria Patri in honorem Ssmae Trinitatis, aut in memoriam Quinque Vulnerum D. N. Iesu Christi, consequetur Indulgentiam trecentorum dierum.

7. Quisquis pro fidelibus oraverit qui sunt in transitu vitae, vel saltem pro iis semel dixerit *Pater noster* cum *Ave Maria*, centum dierum Indulgentiam lucrabitur.

8. Quisquis, demum, in mortis articulo constitutus, animam suam devote Deo commendaverit et, iuxta instructionem fel. rec. Benedicti XIV in Const. quae incipit *Pia mater* 5 aprilis 1747, paratum se exhibuerit obsequenti animo mortem a Deo opperiri, et vere poenitens, confessus ac S. Communione refectus vel si id nequiverit, saltem contritus invocaverit corde, si labiis sit impeditus, Ssmum nomen Iesu, plenariam Indulgentiam consequetur.

Datum Romae, ex S. Poenitentiaria Apostolica, die 17 februarii 1922.

L. ✠ S.

BERNARDUS COLOMBO, *S. P. Regens.*
IO. BAPT. MENGHINI, *Substitutus.*

DECISION REGARDING THE RIGHT OF A CANON CO-ADJUTOR TO PRESIDE AT A CATHEDRAL CHAPTER

(December 11, 1920)

[The decision was not published until January, 1922]

SACRA CONGREGATIO CONCILII

PLACENTINA

JURIS PRAESIDENDI

Die 11 decembris 1920

SPECIES FACTI.—Per Bullam Apostolicae Datariae die 22 ianuarii 1917 datam, sac. Aegidius Agazini constitutus est canonicus coadiutor cum iure futurae successionis D. Camilli Mangot, Praepositi ecclesiae cathedralis Placentinae. Quum vero in praefata cathedrali ecclesia ad canonicum Praepositum, qui primam obtinet dignitatem in Capitulo, ius spectet praesidendi coetibus capitularibus, ante quam can. Agazini coadiutoriae possessionem nancisceretur, in conventu capitulari quaestio instituta est utrum coadiutor iisdem praecedentiae iuribus, quibus potiebatur coadiutus, frui deberet. Et quamvis neque ex iure communi neque ex Bulla nominationis id ei competere capitularibus visum esset, die tamen 8 maii 1917 supplicem ad Episcopum obtulerunt libellum ut ad quaestionem solvendam opportunum dubium S. Sedi proponeret.

Quare Episcopus, Capituli precibus annuens, die 12 eiusdem mensis, supplicem ipsius Capituli libellum ad Sacram hanc Congregationem misit, adnotans Can. Praepositum esse 'la prima Dignità del Capitolo con diritto almeno consuetudinario di presiedere le adunanze capitolari: in sua assenza presiede il Canonico anziano,' et factum commemorans D. Iosephi Caminati qui, cum esset coadiutor canonici Praepositi a mense maio 1880 usque ad mensem martium 1892, iure praesidendi

in coetibus capitularibus usus est, Capitulo minime contradicente. Tandem transcribit verba Bullae nominationis Can. Agazini quibus coadiutoria ita eidem conceditur ut 'omnibus privilegiis et gratiis quibus dictus Camillus [i.e. Can. Praepositus Mangot] ratione praefatae Praepositurae fruitur, pariter frui possit ac valeat [Coadiutor].'—Nihilominus ad has Episcopi litteras Sacra haec Congregatio die 16 eiusdem mensis rescripsit: 'In casu omnibus attentis, canonicum coadiutorem Aegidium Agazini non habere ius praesidendi coetibus capitularibus.'

De his omnibus cum certior factus esset Can. Aegidius Agazini, qui quaestionem hucusque penitus ignoraverat, die 4 decembris 1917 ad S. H. C. recurrit atque probare contendit, si minime ex iure communi aut vi Bullae nominationis, saltem ex consuetudine ius sibi competere praesidendi coetibus capitularibus, idque demonstrare nititur duobus exemplis suorum antecessorum, Caminati, de quo supra, et can. coadiutoris Bissi a. 1817 cuius exstant adhuc quaedam acta capitularia hac formula incipientia: 'Noi *Prevosto Coadiutore*, Capitolo e Canonici,' etc. Pluribus idecirco ad rem allatis, enixis precibus postulavit ut res integra deferretur ad plenarium Eñorum Patrum coetum. Omnibus itaque de more peractis, et utraque parte suas deductiones proponente, subiectum fuit Eñis Patribus dubium:

'An canonicus coadiutor ius habeat praesidendi coetibus capitularibus in casu.'

SYNOPSIS DISCEPTATIONIS.—Quod attinet ius commune, quaestio expedita est, cum ipse recurrens minime ex hoc titulo praetensum praesidendi ius vindicet, sed immo provocet ad verba cl. Oietti, *Syn. rer. mor.* etc., vol. I, p. 930, n. 1227, ubi docetur haec officia et praerogativas minime stricto iure deberi, sed aliquando permitti in litteris Apostolicis, vel etiam deberi ex legitima consuetudine. Et merito. Enimvero canone 397 Codices iur. can. clare edicitur: 'Nisi aliud in statutis capitularibus caveatur, dignitatibus et canonicis *secundum ordinem praecedentiae* ius et officium est: convocare capitulum eique praeesse ac praescribere et ordinare quae ad chori directionem referantur, dummodo dignitas sit de gremio Capitulo.' Atqui in primis certum est canonicis coadiutoribus non competere ius praecedendi super veris canonicis. Cfr. S. R. C. decr. auth. 1037 statutis: 'Coadiutor etiam primae dignitatis qualemcumque clausulam in litteris apostolicis expressam minime suffragari quin ipse ultimae dignitati, tametsi annuali, digniorem locum deferre teneatur.' Unde et S. C. Concilii die 28 iunii 1873 respondit: 'Praepositi coadiutorem sedere debere post omnes dignitates tam praesente quam absente coadiuto.' Et ratio est quia praecedentia, sicut antiquioritas, concipi nequit sine possessione ipsius beneficii: ast cum coadiutor, ut habet De Herdt, *Prax. cap.* II, § 5, 'non sit verus canonicus sed fictus, non habens ius seu titulum in beneficium, sed tantum exercitium et administrationem nomine coadiuti, penes quem residet totale ius in beneficium,' sequitur in nullam possessionem beneficii coadiutorem mitti valere: 'nullo modo—ait Pignatellus, t. IX, cons. 185, n. 39—fuit ei acquisita vera possessio, cum duo in solidum eodem tempore possidere nequeant, sed tantum

fuit acquisita possessio administrationis quae non suffragatur ad effectum praecedentiae' (Similia vide apud Scarfant., *ad Ceccop.*, I, tit. XII, n. 5; Barbosa, *de can. et dign.*, c. XXIX, n. 26 etc.). Hinc etiam liquet, secundo, canonicum coadiutorem non esse vere et proprie de gremio capituli, quae altera conditio explicitis verbis a Codice, can. cit., etiam in dignitate vera requiritur ad effectum praesidendi Capitulo.

Quod vero pertinet ad ius peculiare in casu, istud ne a recurrente quidem deducitur ex verbis Bullae collationis, in qua explicita et expressa mentio praetensi iuris praesidendi non invenitur. Neque illa suppleri potest ex generali clausula qua conceditur ut coadiutor pariter frui possit ac valeat omnibus privilegiis et gratiis quibus fruitur coadiutus ratione praepositurae: his enim verbis ea intelliguntur quibus opus est coadiutori ad officium implendum quod specificatur: 'eidem ecclesiae in divinis ac alias inserviendi, et curam animarum exercendi, et singulas alias obligationes ac parochialia munia et officia coadiuto incumbentia supportandi.' 'Coadiutoriae enim—ita Ferraris, v. *Canonicatus*, art. X, n. 1—fuerunt principaliter inveciae ne Ecclesiae ob impedimentum coadiuti suo defraudetur servitio. . . . Et ideo, licet omnes et singulae praerogativae et honores coadiuti coadiutori tribuerentur, haec tamen omnia esse ad servitium Ecclesiae referenda asserit Garcias, *de benef.*, p. IV, c. 5, n. 26.' Cf. Pignat., loc. cit., n. 2; Bened. XIV, quaest. 136; Lotter., *de ben.*, q. 25, n. 36.

Itaque punctum praecipuum super quo vertitur controversia, in consuetudine consistit unde potissimum, inmo unice, recurrens praetensum ius sibi derivare contendit: 'non fa il ricorrente questione di diritto propriamente detto, ma di consuetudine più che centenaria, per cui al canonico coadiutore fu riconosciuta o almebo accordata la facoltà di presidere.' Ad hanc tamen consuetudinem probandam non afferuntur nisi *duo* casus, alter ex anno 1817, alter ex anno 1880: licet autem contrarii non afferantur, quia—teste Episcopo—nullus alius fuit datus praeposito pro tempore coadiutor toto centenatio mox elapso, tamen, attenta distantia qua inter se hi casus separantur, minime videtur ea inde probari frequentia et actuum continuatio quae ad inducendam legitimam consuetudinem requiritur.

Praeterea obiicit et ostendit Capitulum, Bullas nominationum utriusque canonici Caminati et Bissi satis differre in hoc puncto a Bulla qua nominatus est canonicus recurrens: nam per illas Sedes Apostolica concessit: 'stallum in choro, ac vocem et *votum in capitulo*, necnon locum in processionibus aliisque capitularibus actibus . . . cum omnibus et singulis privilegiis . . . *praeeminentiis*, antelationibus et gratiis quibus dictus coadiutus utitur,' etc. Ulterius constat non levem circumstantiarum diversitatem haberi inter casus qui afferuntur et casum de quo disceptatur: uterque enim coadiutor nominatus fuit praevio consensu Capituli, qui consensus in casu recurrentis requisitus non fuit; uterque liber omnino erat ab aliis negotiis et officiis, dum coadiutor in casu gravissimum pondus curae animarum sustinere debet: hinc facile explicatur cur in praecedentibus casibus Capitulum facile acquieverit et permiserit utrumque coadiutorem coetibus capitularibus praesidere, quod in

praesenti casu non obtinet. Quamobrem, ut alia sileamus, non abest a casibus qui afferuntur causa *precarii*, qua prohibetur ut inde verum ius possessione acquiratur. Audiatur Scarfantoni, loc. cit., lib. I, tit. XIII, n. 38: 'Quod si Capitulum *passum fuisset* coadiutores varias explevisse *functiones vel locum occupasse* contra id quod de iure eis permissum est et gerere spectat, non *per hoc possunt huiusmodi Coadiutores petere manutentionem* sub praetextu quasi-possessionis adeptae in exercitio actuum praedictorum, quia isti praesumuntur gesti precario, ideoque sunt inhabiles ad obtinendam manutentionem; *ac admissio ad eos exercendos censetur facta ad libitum canonicorum, quibus licet nolle quod diu etiam placuit.*' Et Pignatellus, loc. cit. consult. 185, n. 9: 'Posito quod coadiutor non sit in possessione huiusmodi praerogativae nisi pro lubitu canonicorum et precario, sequitur quod *nulla praescriptio ad eius favorem inducta est, neque allegari possit in consuetudo, quae, non praescripta, nullum ius tribuit.*'

ANIMADVERSIONES EX OFFICIO.—Enunciatae deductiones satis ostendunt in casu quo de agitur, consuetudinem legitime praescriptam deficere. Haud ab re tamen videtur inquirere, num, in praesenti iure quo utimur Codicis, *sola* consuetudo afferri valeat ut legitimus titulus praesidentiae vel praecedentiae favore coadiutorum.

Et videtur negativam sententiam praevalere oportere. Enimvero, ut supra ostensum est cum agebatur de iure communi, rationes cur huiusmodi ius coadiutoribus abnuatur, petuntur *ex ipsa natura* rei seu officii coadiutoralis: quatenus nempe coadiutor nullam possessionem habet *beneficii*, et ideo verus non est sed *fictus* canonicus, neque ullo modo censi potest *de gremio* esse Capituli. Atqui consuetudines quae id efficerent quod natura rei sinere nequit, iam ex hoc ipso habendae forent profecto ut irrationabiles.

In casu Codex adeo fortiter requirit ad praesidentiam ut quis sit *de gremio capituli*,—ut iuxta superius dicta—ipsis dignitatibus veris et effectivis huiuscemodi ius concedat sub hac restrictiva clausula: *dummodo sit de gremio capituli*: quanto magis id adversari dicendum est coadiutoribus? Et animadvertatur generatim, Codicem in casu nonnisi unicam exceptionem admittere, nimirum 'salvis statutis particularibus,' dum commode, si casus tulisset, etiam consuetudines contrarias, ut in aliis sexcentis casibus, commemorare valuisset. Id clare ostendit consuetudines contrarias, in casu, utpote oppositas menti legislatoris esse habendas, et ideo, ad summum, tantummodo ad tramites can. 5 tolerandas. Ad summum—inquam—quia quae irrationabiles esse demonstrantur, nec talem quidem tolerantiam admittunt, ut planum est.

Nec demum praetereundum est in capitulo Placentino statuta particularia haberi magis etiam restrictiva quam ius Codicis. Nam cessante prima dignitate, constitutiones capitulares ius praesidendi devolvunt, non quidem ad dignitatem sequentem, sed ad *antiquiorem* ex canonicis, 'licet hic—explicite cavetur—sit in ordine subdiaconali.' Quum, iuxta laudata Codicis verba, praescriptum constitutionum in casu omnino praeservetur atque ut lex sit servandus, vix dicere attinet quantum e

contrario vulneraretur si praesidendi ius ei qui non solum antiquior non est ex canonicis, sed nondum est canonicus decerneretur. Atqui certum est nullam consuetudinem dari posse in Capitulis adversus constitutiones capitulares, cum inimo quilibet canonicus in actu possessionis capiendae de earumdem religiosa observantia iusiurandum nuncupare teneatur.

Quare, etc.

RESOLUTIO.—Porro in plenariis Eñorum Patrum comitiis habitis die 11 decembris 1920 in Palatio apostolico Vaticano, proposito dubio Sacra Concilii Congregatio respondendum censuit: *Negative*.

Quam resolutionem referente postridie infrascripto S. C. Secretario, Sanctissimus D. N. Benedictus divina Providentia Papa XV approbare et confirmare dignatus est.

I. MORI, *Secretarius*.

A NEW COLLEGE FOR THE FOREIGN MISSIONS IS ERECTED IN THE HOLY CITY

(January 25, 1921)

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE PROPAGANDA FIDE

DECRETUM

NOVUM COLLEGIUM MISSIONUM A SANCTO ALEXIO DE FALCONERIIS O.S.M.
IN URBE ERIGITUR

Quo abundantius idoneos ministros sacris missionibus apud exterarum gentes suppeditare valeat, Sacrum hoc Consilium Christiano Nomini Propagando, cuius potissimum est, pro suo munere, Summi Pontificis studio dilatandae Fidei, nuperrime litteris encyclicis quoque manifestato, obsecundare, in sententiam venit novum Missionum Collegium in hac alma Urbe erigendi, in quo delecti alumni ad sacras expeditiones peragendas, praesertim apud Africae atque Americae gentes, iuxta normam adnexorum statutorum instituerentur.

Ipsius autem Collegii, a S. Alexio de Falconeriis nuncupandi, sedes figenda pro nunc ad Sancti Nicolai Tolentinatis, apud religiosos Ordinis Servorum Mariae visa est, in meliores aptioresque aedes proxime transferenda.

Hanc vero Sacri Consilii sententiam Ssñus D. N. Benedictus div. Provid. Pp. XV in audientia diei 24 labentis mensis ianuarii, infrascripto S. Congregationis Secretario impertita, approbare ratamque habere dignatus est, ac praesens decretum, quo Collegium praedictum erigitur atque constituitur cum omnibus iuribus ac privilegiis similibus Institutis concessis, confici iussit.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 25 ianuarii 1921, in festo conversionis sancti Pauli Apostoli.

G. M. CARD. VAN ROSSUM, *Praefectus*.

C. LAURENTI, *Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

CONFIRMATION OF THE IMMEMORIAL CULT OF THE SERVANT OF GOD, BLESSED ANDREW FRANCHI, BISHOP

(November 23, 1921)

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

PISTORIEN.

CONFIRMATIONIS CULTUS AB IMMEMORABILI TEMPORE PRAESTITI SERVO DEI
ANDREAE FRANCHI, EPISCOPO PISTORIENSII, ORDINIS PRAEDICATORUM,
BEATO NUNCUPATO

Inter Episcopos qui saeculo XIV Ecclesiam Pistoriensem gubernarunt, doctrina et vitae sanctitate refulsit Andreas Franchi, decus quoque et ornamentum Ordinis Praedicatorum. Quapropter Pistorienses cives eorumque rectores, ac praesertim illius Ecclesiae praesules, ad Causam beatificationis Servi Dei promovendam, pluries vota deprompserunt atque manus admoverunt. Verum communia vota executioni demandanda curavit Episcopus Pistoriensis Andreas Santi fe. re., qui, anno 1911, Processu ordinaria auctoritate absoluto, de confirmatione cultus immemoralis Servi Dei sententiam favorem pronuntiavit, actis processualibus ad sacrorum rituum Congregationem transmissis pro ipsorum Apostolica confirmatione.—Antequam de ordine et forma iudicii atque de exitu Causae fiat sermo, aliquid innuere liceat de ortu, vita et obitu, necnon de fama sanctitatis et de cultu ecclesiastico ipsius Famuli Dei. Hic, Pistoriensi in urbe, ex clara progenie de Franchis vel de Bocagnis ortus anno 1335, et a piis parentibus recte institutus, inde a pueritia futurae virtutis et vocationis religiosae praebeuit indicia. Adolescens hanc vivendi rationem amplexatus in Ordine Fratrum Praedicatorum, patre ab initio contradicente, habitum religiosum induit in Conventu Pistoriensi Sancti Dominici, die 25 martii anno 1351. Inter alumnos pietate et ingenio praestans, doctoratus gradus Romae summa cum laude assequutus est. Sacerdotio auctus, e Superiorum iussu, variis in scholis docendi munere mirifice ac fructuose fungitur, simulque sacro ministerio, potissimum praedicationis evangelicae ex instituto sui Ordinis, incumbit cum animarum solatio et profectu. Omnem laudem et gloriam non sibi, sed unice Deo referebat bonorum omnium auctori et largitori, apud quem assidua oratione instabat, plures diu noctuque transiens horas ad pedes sanctissimi Crucifixi. Beatissimam Virginem Mariam cum Iesu Infante ac sanctos Magos peculiari devotione coluit, et Oratorium confratrum nobilium Pistoriensium, sub invocatione ipsorum sanctorum erectum, amplificavit sacrisque redemptionis mysteriis decorari iussit. Episcopo Pistoriensi, Ioanni de Vincentiis, Ordinis Eremitarum Sancti Augustini, vita functo, clero et populo enixe postulante et Summo Pontifice benigne confirmante, suffectus est Frater Andreas Franchi, sacerdos Ordinis Praedicatorum, qui in virtute obedientiae grave episcopatus onus cum metu et tremore suscepit. Qua vero ratione Episcopus Andreas se gesserit in pastoralis officio exercendo sufficiat recolere quae de prototypo pastore sanctus Bernardus Abbas scripsit Beato Eugenio Papae III, praesertim in libro IV, versus finem: ‘De

cetero, considera oportere te esse formam iustitiae, sanctimoniae speculum, pietatis exemplar, assertorem veritatis, Fidei defensorem,' etc. Quod confirmatur ex iis quae de ipso Andrea tradidit sanctus Antoninus, Archiepiscopus Florentinus, Servo Dei aequalis: 'Prorsus miranda res, et quasi incredibile negotium, nisi oculis nostris vidissemus; multi enim et magni et obdurati peccatores tunc conversi sunt ad poenitentiam, quos Deus ad se vocavit anno sequenti, peste grassante. . . . Innumerae paces ex mortiferas et diutinis inimiciis in diversis locis confectae sunt, confessiones et communiones frequentatae. Mira hospitalitas ubique, et benigna susceptio; a communitatibus providebatur de victu etiam mille hominibus sine pretio.'—Mensae autem episcopalis redditus Dei Famulus ita distribuit ut maiorem partem impenderet pauperibus piisque operibus subveniendis, divini cultus decori sacrisque functionibus provehendis, atque sacellis construendis et ornandis, et reliquam partem minimam reservaret pro suis necessitatibus vitaeque conservatione. Insuper palatium episcopale, quod a fundamentis excitaverat, diversorium erat peregrinorum quibus ipse victum quoque ministrabat ac pedes humiliter lavabat. Quod ita placuit Christo Domino, ut Servo suo, uti fertur, tribueret seipsum recipere sibi inservire sub specie pauperis.—Exactis viginti tribus annis ab episcopatu suscepto, anno 1400, ob rationabiles et iustas causas, de Superiorum consensu, pastorale officium sponte dimisit et in coenobium Sancti Dominici libentius rediit. Tum, orationi rerumque caelestium contemplationi, prout ipse erat inclinatus, liberius totum se dedit; atque supernis donis et charismatibus donatus fuit. Brevi post letahli morbo vexatus est, quem patientissime tulit, eoque ingravescente, Sacramentis Ecclesiae refectus, obdormivit in Domino die 26 maii 1401. In signum et testimonium existimationis et venerationis tum clerus tum populus ad iusta funebria confluit, Sacrum solemniter peragente ipso Episcopo Matthaeo de Diamantibus, qui Andreae episcopatum renuntianti in dioecesis regimine successerat, adstantibus sodalibus una cum Magistro generali Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum. Corpus autem Servi Dei in ecclesiam Sancti Dominici delatum ibique repositum fuit in sepulcro quod paraverat eius frater Bartholomaeus, protonotarius apostolicus et Ecclesiae Pratensi praepositus. Una cum fama sanctitatis statim ab obitu, aequali gradu progressus est cultus publicus et ecclesiasticus Andreae exhibitus, quem ad hanc usque aetatem absque interruptione viguisse ac vigere asserunt et probant Causae actores. Studiose enim colligunt et proferunt argumenta ad rem pertinentia: ex kalendariis in quibus Servus Dei cum aliis Beatis et sanctis Ordinis Praedicatorum adnotatur, ex titulo Beati ore et scripto passim eidem tributo, ex reliquiis, imaginibus, numismatibus publicae venerationi expositis vel fidelibus ad pietatem fovendam distributis. Ipsi actores tradunt quod in praefata ecclesia Pistoriensi Sancti Dominici, ubi corpus asservatur, quotannis die 26 vel 27 mensis maii, festum celebratur Servi Dei, et ad eius corpus exstant tabellae votivae, lampades accensae, aliaeque dona oblata in gratiarum actione; atque in ipsa ecclesia floret pia Congregatio sub nomine Beati Andreae instituta, a Romanis Pontificibus recognita et privilegiis ditata.—Hisce

aliisque argumentis et documentis, una cum testimonio historiographorum, eorum praesertim qui ab anno 1634 ad annum nostrum de Beato Andrea scripserunt, accurate perpensis, Episcopus Pistoriensis et Pratensis de cultu immemoriali seu casu excepto affirmativam protulit sententiam; atque acta processualia, anno 1911 absoluta, statim Romam ad sacrorum titulum Congregationem transmisit. Quum vero, ob rationes extrinsecas, nobilis haec Causa usque ad hos postremos annos moram passa sit, Rñus P. Ludovicus Fanfani, Ordinis Praedicatorum postulator generalis, a Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Benedicto Papa XV petiit atque obtinuit; per decretum sacrae rituum Congregationis, die 26 aprilis 1920, ut, attentis peculiaribus adiunctis expositis, eadem Causa de cultu immemoriali seu casu excepto agatur apud sacram rituum Congregationem, ad normam veteris iuris, cum dispensatione a recentioribus decretis datis diebus 11 novembris 1912 et 31 ianuarii 1913, confirmatis per Codicem iuris canonici, titulo XXV, 'de Processu Servorum Dei per viam cultus seu casus excepti.' Quae cum ita sint, rogante praeaudato Postulatore generali, vota quoque depromente universi Ordinis Sancti Dominici, Eñus et Rñus Dñus Cardinalis Victorius Amadeus Ranuzzi de Bianchi, huius Causae Ponens seu Relator, in ordinario, sacrorum rituum Congregationis coetu subsignata die ad Vaticanas aedes coacto, sequens dubium discutiendum proposuit: *An sententia lata ab Illmo et Rmo Dño Episcopo Pistoriensi et Pratensi super cultu ab immemorabili tempore exhibito praefato Servo Dei, seu super casu excepto a decretis sa. me. Urbani Papae VIII, sit confirmanda in casu et ad effectum de quo agitur?* Et sacra rituum Congregatio, post relationem Eñi Pontentis, audito voce et scripto R. P. D. Angelo Mariani, Fidei promotore generali, omnibus accurate perpensis rescribendum censuit: *Affirmative, seu confirmandam esse sententiam*; die 15 novembris 1921.

Quibus omnibus Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Benedicto Papae XV per infrascriptum Cardinalem sacrae rituum Congregationi Praefectum relatis, Sanctitas Sua rescriptum eiusdem Sacri Consilii ratum habuit et confirmavit die 23 eisdem mense et anno.

✠ A. CARD. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,
S. R. C. Praefectus.

L. ✠ S.

ALEXANDER VERDE, Secretarius.

DECREE REGARDING THE BEATIFICATION AND CANONIZATION OF THE SERVANT OF GOD, LEONARDI MURIALDO, FOUNDER OF THE PIOUS SOCIETY OF ST. JOSEPH

(November 23, 1921)

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

TAURINEN.

BEATIFICATIONIS ET CANONIZATIONIS SERVI DEI LEONARDI MURIALDO, SACERDOTIS ET FUNDATORIS PIAE SOCIETATIS SANCTI IOSEPH

Augustae Taurinorum, die 26 octobris anno 1828, a piis honestique coniugibus Leonardo Murialdo ac Teresia Rho, natus est Dei Famulus,

eique die sequenti per baptismum regenerato in parochiali Sancti Dalmatii ecclesia, nomina Leonardus, Ioannes Baptista, Donatus ac Maria imposita sunt. Octo annos agens, Savonam ductus, apud Scholarum Piarum Patres, qui peculiarem curam circa puerorum eruditionem profitentur, institutus est. Ingenio praestens, obedientia promptus, pietate fervens, Sacramentis recipiendis assiduus, conlegii alumnis praeclara reliquit exempla. A matre in patriam revocatus ac pio et docto sacerdoti Pullini traditus, in huius disciplina, plures doctrinae ac virtutis effecit progressus. Audito sermone de poenis inferni, primum se nomen dare cogitavit Ordini Franciscali Capulatorum, sed, probati viri ecclesiastici consilio suscepto, in clerum saecularem se adscribere voluit atque, redeunte eius die natali 26 octobris anno 1845, in ecclesia Sanctae Clarae clericalem habitum, a confessario benedictum, libenter induit. In regio athenaeo Taurinensi variis disciplinis addiscendis sedulo incubuit, sed praecipue in Seminario eiusdem civitatis studiis theologicis et Sacrae Scripturae egregiam sane operam navavit, adeo ut in Academiam Solarianam furit adscitus et, facto periculo, unanimi doctorum suffragio, laurea theologica meruit decorari atque doctor theologus renuntiari.—Clero Sanctae Mariae adlectus, servato pristino vivendi more, magno fervore et diligenti praeparatione per omnium Ordinum gradus ascendens, ad presbyteratum evectus est, die 21 septembris anni 1851. Sacerdotio vix inito, eius pietas et caritas uberes dederunt fructus per eruditionem puerorum et adolescentium in oratorio ab Angelo tutelari nuncupato et in altero Sancti Aloisii a Ven. Ioanne Bosco condito, quo rogante et comite Rua, anno 1857, Sodalibus Salesianis iucundo animo et ferventi studio se obtulit in laborum et operum socium.—In conlegio etiam Sociarum Iesu et in Instituto parvulorum opificum sacerdotali ministerio salutariter functus est.—Anno 1865, una cum parentibus, Parisios se contulit, ubi, in Seminario Sancti Sulpitii degens, sacras disciplinas ab exiniis professoribus plenius hausit, tum in ipso Seminario tum in Athenaeo, simulque praebuit publica et optima ingenii sui specimina.—Anno post, Taurinum reversus, conlegii artificum regimen tenuit, quo tempore ipse eleemosynas a divitibus atque stipem extra ecclesiae ianuam quaeritare non erubuit ad ipsum conlegium alieno aere gravatum sublevandum. Insuper totus erat alumnis religiose instituendis, quos diligenti praeparatione excitabat ad Sacramenta rite ac devote recipienda, bonosque mores custodiendos ac tutandos. Urbanitate, patientia, sedulitate ipse sibi alliciebat pueros et adultos, pluresque errantes ad rectam viam bonamque frugem reduxisse fertur. Ex eius discipulis non pauci religiosa Instituta ingressi sunt et circiter octoginta sacerdotio aucti.—Neque illius caritas defuit nosocomiis, carceribus aliisque institutis misericordiae operibus addictis, in aegrotorum, captivorum aliorumque egentium levamen et corporis animaeque salutem. Catholicis consociationibus provehendis, tum in Gallia tum in Italia, plures coetus habiti sunt, quibus ipse religionis et patriae incensus amore adstitit, atque in commune bonum, utilem operam dedit mutuaque vice recepit. Inter quos digne commemoratur conventus ille Pedemontanae regionis, apud Montem Vicum, anno

1880, in quo de suis operibus retulit, ceterosque ad similia et maiora excitavit.—Comitatus et Operi Sancti Caroli Borromaei nomine ac patrocinio insignito, vulgo *La buona stampa*, ad ephemerides aliaque scripta religioni catholicae consona excitanda, imprimenda, evulganda, Leonardus, ad Archiepiscopo Cardinali Alimonda praepositus, pretiosam tulit opem.—Quod Leonardus olim dixerat: ‘Opus quod nos Superiores et assistentes agimus, vinculi religiosi merito augeamus,’ hoc ipse perfecit per se et per selectos iuvenes et viros assistentes. Praehabito enim consilio et incitamento quorundam sacerdotum et tam Episcopi Albensis quam Archiepiscopi Taurinensis, novam Congregationem religiosam instituendam curavit. Haec Societas, a Sancto Ioseph nuncupata, inaugurata fuit anno 1873, die 19 martii, ipsi castissimo Beatae Mariae Virginis Sponso sacra, eademque die Leonardus primus professionem emisit iuxta regulas in similibus Institutis probatas. Deinceps, die 14 februarii anni 1875, ab Archiepiscopo Taurinensi approbata et successive, anno 1890, decreto laudis honorata, anno demum 1904 die 1 augusti, cum votis simplicibus constituta, confirmationem Apostolicam obtinuit. Piae Societati iure pontificio recognitae, Cardinalis Protector assignatus est, et munus Superioris, cunctis suffragiis, Leonardo delatum, quod ipse, etsi reluctans, tamen sodalibus et praepositis enixe instantibus, cum merito humilitatis et obedientiae suscepit. Auctis eisdem Societatis alumnis, domibus iam fundatis et florentibus aliae permultae intra et extra Italiam accesserunt cum vario titulo nuncupatae, nempe Oratoria, Patronatus Conlegia, Orphanotrofia, Scholae Apostolicae aut Agricolae, iuxta peculiarem finem proprium.—Humilis Dei Servus ab ipso nomine fundatoris declinavit, unice intentus ad Superioris munia recte peragenda in gloriam sui Domini et in omne bonum suorum alumnorum provehendum. Romani Pontificis et Ecclesiae catholicae iuribus et doctrinis addictissimus, sanctorum Patrum ac Doctorum, speciatim sancti Alfonsi Mariae de Ligorio, sequens vestigia, perniciosos errores, potissimum Iansenistarum, validissime impugnavit, paratus ad omnia, usque ad mortem pro iustitia et libertate Ecclesiae adserenda ac tuenda.—Aegritudine, qua Leonardus diu afflictabatur, mense martio anni 1900 ingravescente, et die vigesimasexta in peius vertente, Sacramentis Ecclesiae devotissime receptis, inter filios et sodales suos, orantes et moerentes, quos sanctis verbis hortatus fuerat et paterno amore benedixerat, homo Dei piissimam animam exhalavit die trigesima eiusdem mensis et anni. Defuncti corpus biduo mansit expositum in cubiculo, confluyente, in signum aestimationis et venerationis, multitudinem civium; postea, in duplici arca inclusum et in ecclesiam Sanctae Barbarae delatum, funere solemniter peracto, in sepulcretum deductum fuit et, in conditorio familiae depositum, in pace quiescit.—Interim, fama sanctitatis quam Dei Famulus vivens adeptus fuerat, post obitum magis clara et diffusa, causam dedit ut super ea in ecclesiastica Curia Taurinensi, ordinaria auctoritate, institueretur Processus Informativus, cuius acta, vix absoluta, statim Romam ad sacrorum rituum Congregationem transmissa sunt. Instante autem R^{mo} D^{ño} Camillo Panizzardi, Piae Societatis a Sancto Ioseph procuratore generali et huius Causae

postulatore, attentisque litteris postulatoriis quorundam Eñorum S. R. E. Cardinalium, plurium Archiepiscoporum et Episcoporum, necnon Capitulorum, et parochorum Taurinensium atque Ordinum et Congregationum regularium, piarum Sodalitatum atque illustrium virorum ac mulierum, quum, servato iuris ordine, atque scriptis Servi Dei revisis, nihil obstat quominus ad ulteriora procedatur, Eñus et Rñus Dñus Cardinalis Theodorus Valfré di Bonzo, eiusdem Causae Ponens seu Relator, in ordinariis sacrorum rituum Congregationis comitiis, subsignata die ad Vaticanas aedes coadunatis, sequens dubium discutiendum proposuit: *An sit signanda Commissio introductionis Causae, in casu et ad effectum de quo agitur?* Et Eñi ac Rñi Patres sacris tuendis ritibus praepositi, post relationem ipsius Eñi Ponentis, audito voce et scripto R. P. D. Angelo Mariani, Fidei promotore generali, omnibus accurate perpensis, rescribendum consuerunt: *Affirmative, seu signandam esse Commissionem introductionis Causae, et Sanctissimo placuerit*; die 15 novembris 1921.

Facta postmodum de his Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Benedicto Papae XV per infrascriptum Cardinalem sacrae rituum Congregationi Praefectum relatione, Sanctitas Sua rescriptum eiusdem sacrae Congregationis ratum habens, propria manu signare dignata est Commissionem introductionis Causae beatificationis et canonizationis Servi Dei Leonardi Murialdo, sacerdotis, fundatoris Piae Societatis Sancti Ioseph; die 28 eisdem mense et anno.

✠ A. CARD. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,
S. R. C. Praefectus.

ALEXANDER VERDE, Secretarius.

L. ✠ S.

REVIEWS AND NOTES

ETHICS : GENERAL AND SPECIAL. By Owen Hill, S.J. London : Harding and More, Ltd.

PUBLIC attention has, in recent years, been strongly focussed on certain ethical problems, and not merely theological magazines, but even the daily newspapers have opened their columns to vigorous, if somewhat acrid controversies on the morality of certain actions. Rebellion, Hunger-strike, 'Boycotting' are but a few of the questions which have agitated the public conscience so deeply.

A new volume of Ethics is, therefore, assured of a ready welcome : one looks for a clear statement of the underlying principles, a full and illuminative discussion of special questions, and a reasoned decision. How far the present volume satisfies these expectations we shall discuss in a moment. At the very outset a serious problem confronts the Catholic writer on Ethics : it is the question of the medium of exposition. Scholastic Ethics have been almost universally written in Latin, and we have a traditional exposition and argumentation in crisp, if not very elegant, Latin. Unfortunately, nowadays, if one wishes to appeal to a wide audience, it is necessary to select a more popular medium. The forceful idiomatic turns of the Latin exposition cannot be easily rendered in English. Hence the dilemma : a wide appeal, or a break with the tradition. The present author has made the desperate venture of giving the traditional exposition as literally as possible, but in English. At the head of each chapter is a thesis, or rather aggregation of three or four theses. Under the heading of 'Question' he gives a running commentary on these theses. Then, under 'Terms,' he explains every single word of the thesis, according to the Scholastic terms and divisions and distinctions, paragraph after paragraph, unto the bitter end (sometimes running to 18 closely printed pages). Next 'Proofs.' For every scrap of thesis syllogism after syllogism stalks forth, gaunt and bare, and fires its 'ergo.' Then it submits to dismemberment. 'With regard to the Major'—and the Major is driven home. 'With regard to the Minor'—and it, too, is settled, luckily if without distinction and contradistinction, till the printed page reels before our eyes. Finally, there is the heading of 'Principle.' As a reward for perseverance, the author has a surprise in store. There is a serried rank of paragraphs with their Roman numerals. A proof is repeated, a distinction is emphasized, a term re-explained, sometimes an objection is dealt with—each with its paragraph of one line or of forty : but principles we looked for, and there were none. Perhaps the word has a different meaning in America.

This treatment is repeated for each of the thirty-one theses which

make up the book. The result is wearisome in the extreme : what is of value in the work is so drowned in a torrent of verbiage and tautology that the work of rescue leaves one quite exhausted. Repetitions are innumerable : the author is not content to say a thing, he must come back on it, even unto the third or fourth time. A culpable degree of negligence and slovenliness is manifest in the many mis-statements and inaccuracies : the author saw fit to give us a résumé in one page of the Church's system of matrimonial impediments, though it is hard to see the necessity for it in a work of this kind ; but, waiving that, he might at least have given them in their present form and not in the pre-Code form that was abolished four years ago. The style does not lend anything to the treatment : it is jagged, uneven, and jolting. At times it rolls with thunderous weight, more often it barks disastrously, like machine-gun fire. The following specimen illustrates method, style, and degree of accuracy. It is under the heading of Principles :—

‘ H.—We can reject a gift. Life is a gift. *Ergo*.

Answer. A gift meant primarily for our advantage, and subject to absolute ownership, I grant ; a gift meant primarily for the giver's advantage, and subject to only use-ownership, I deny.

N.B.—Suicide is more than rejection, it is destruction of life.’

We have been at pains to give the transcript exactly as it is in the book. We leave it to the reader to see how the immorality of suicide is upheld.

We cannot refrain from another quotation. It is under Proofs—Women's Suffrage is being demolished :—

‘ Suffrage is not an inborn right, but a means of government. Natural has two senses, inborn and becoming. Inborn in neither man nor woman : becoming in man, unbecoming in woman. It is an acquired right even in man. It is a question of expediency of the proper. Not that woman is inferior to man, but different from man. Men adapted by nature to some functions, women to others. Hurts woman ; politics is modified war, strife, contention, bitterness. Duty and right of protection rests with the male. True government in family. Women's true functions superior to man's, to form conscience of child, influence will, control impulses. Cardinal Gibbons says : Mary, model of women, not Amazon, not Spartan, not Venus, not Juno.’

Comment is superfluous. Apart from the violence done to grammar, the incoherence of thought makes the work almost unreadable.

As to the subject-matter, the author breaks no new ground : there is no originality of thought or treatment, but close adherence to the Scholastic manuals, without their brevity and clearness. Three theses are devoted to the question of man's end, but no effort is made to explain what is meant by the word morality, and no proof is advanced that the standard of morality is objective order beyond the mere statement that it is so. The subject of the Natural Law is at the foundation of Ethics, and deserves clear and careful treatment. The author is absolutely muddled on it. We have managed to disinter his definitions (p. 47) :

'Natural law objectively taken is made up of what we call morality's first principles, commands issuing from the reason or will of God: each of the principles, like all judgments, contains a subject and predicate and the harmony or discord the natural law subjectively taken helps the mind to detect between these subjects and predicates 'is morality's first principles'! 'Subjectively taken natural law is an inborn habit of mind.' Yet on p. 66 he declares: 'Reason is not the natural law.'

The veriest tyro in Ethics knows the importance of the subject of acts with two effects. It is dismissed here in seventeen lines, which contain several mis-statements and nothing worthy of the name of principle. Probabilism is completely vindicated as the system of St. Alphonsus. The author's attitude to opponents is not to examine and refute them, but to rate them soundly for their stupidity or malice. There is a blustering thoroughness in his condemnations which may be entertaining but is not scientific. Witness the following: 'Communism is insanity or gross depravity. Communism has no redeeming feature. We are bad enough when at our best, but make us Communists and we should in a twinkling degenerate to cut-throats, thieves, devils incarnate. There would be no security at home or abroad. Our very friends would mix our cup with poison. Our lot would be incomparably less endurable than that of lions and tigers roaming the jungle. The remedy for social unrest is union of employer and worker based on inequality: the best form of government is monarchy; women should not have the suffrage, for the average boy is a better politician than his mother.'

We cannot recommend the work to the general reader: it contains nothing original, does not discuss special questions of interest, and is unreadable. Neither could we impose it on any student as a text-book: there is neither clearness, brevity, nor scientific accuracy. The book bears every sign of hasty and ill-digested composition. It imperatively calls for revision and condensation. Whether this should be done now or postponed for the event of a second edition is a question for the author.

M. J. BROWNE.

SAINT PATRICK. By S. M. O. Dublin: Dollard & Co.

FOR the reader who is in search of further light on the many disputed questions regarding the life of our National Apostle—the date of his birth, the place of his birth, the place of his consecration as Bishop, the years of his ministry—this little work will have little attraction. But it will not fail to arrest the attention of those who wish to catch a glimpse of St. Patrick as he really was—as a boy-slave on the mountains of Antrim, as a student in the schools of Gaul, and as a faithful soldier of Christ in Ireland. The Sister of Charity, who dictated the greater part of this work during her last illness, had spent her life in teaching little children devotion to the Faith that St. Patrick planted. It grieved her to find that the people generally had so little knowledge of the saints of their native land. To help to remedy that defect she proposed to compose a simple Life of St. Patrick, 'with a view to

increasing their devotion to our Saint, rather than their knowledge of disputed questions concerning him.' But the Master called her before her plan could be accomplished. In her last illness she sketched the outlines of this little work to a Sister companion, who sympathized with her ideals and who undertook to carry out the design. The promise thus given has been fully carried out. The work is simple, but its very simplicity attracts attention. It deals only with the salient facts of our Saint's life, those that would be most likely to interest the class of readers for whom the writer wished specially to cater. It deserves a wide circulation, as we know of no better work of the kind, particularly for the young.

J. M.

A PAROCHIAL COURSE OF DOCTRINAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR ALL SUNDAYS AND HOLYDAYS OF THE YEAR. Prepared and arranged by the Rev. Charles J. Callan, O.P., and the Rev. John A. M'Hugh, O.P. Vols. 2 and 3. New York: Wagner; London: Herder. 1921.

THIS Course, which is intended to consist of four volumes, two dealing with dogmatic and two with moral topics, is a series of instructions based on a combination of the Catechism of the Council of Trent with the Epistles and Gospels of the Sundays and Holydays throughout the year. Volume 2 is the second of the dogmatic series, and Volume 3 the first of the moral series.

Though it may be disputed whether preachers ought to base their sermons to any great extent on sermons preached by others, it can scarcely be doubted that it is a real advantage to a hard-working missionary priest to have at his disposal a well thought out and well arranged set of points when he has to prepare a doctrinal instruction. The instructions contained in this Course have been carefully prepared by experienced writers and preachers. They are written in a good style. Theologically and Biblically they appear to be very sound. Abundant references to homiletic material and to doctrinal sources are given in connection with each Instruction. Volume 2 covers the period from Pentecost to Advent, and Volume 3 the period from the First Sunday of Advent to the Sixth Sunday after Easter.

B.

A HANDBOOK OF PATROLOGY. By the Rev. J. Tixeront, D.D. Authorized translation, based upon the Fourth French Edition. London: B. Herder Book Co. 1920.

DR. TIXERONT'S *Précis de Patrologie* has run into several editions in France. Its popularity is due to its peculiarly French combination of accurate scholarship and clarity of style. It does not advance any very new or striking theories, but it summarises in an interesting manner the results of recent investigation of patristic literature. English-speaking students have hitherto suffered from the disadvantage of not having within their reach a thoroughly up-to-date, reliable, and readable

small manual of Patrology. A good English version of Dr. Tixeront's *Précis* should remove that disadvantage. The version before us is readable and excellently printed. It is, however, greatly to be regretted that it does not always reproduce exactly the sense of the original, and that it sometimes even actually contradicts the original. On page 7 of the translation, for instance, we read in reference to the *Patrologia Orientalis* of Graffin and Nau: 'The chronological order is followed,' where the original has: *Aucun ordre chronologique n'est suivi*. On page 10 the French, '*le christianisme s'est recruté d'abord dans un milieu peu lettré*,' is rendered, 'the Church recruited her members chiefly from among the illiterate.' One would have expected here a little more reserve in the English. On page 11 we read in the version: 'One or two ringleaders had stirred up the faithful against the presbyters, of whom several, of irreproachable life, had driven them from office.' The corresponding French passage is surprisingly different: '*Un ou deux meneurs y avaient soulevé la masse des fidèles contre les presbytres, dont plusieurs, de vie irréprochable, avaient été destitués de leurs fonctions.*'

Mistranslations of this kind are fairly frequent. They are a serious defect in a manual intended for students who will not be in a position to use the French text. Teachers who recommend this Handbook to their students will need to put them on their guard against the occasional mistakes of the version. The *Précis* of M. Tixeront is in every way so excellent and suitable as a text-book for divinity students, that we should like to see this English version thoroughly corrected in a second edition.

P. BOYLAN.

MORAL PRINCIPLES AND MEDICAL PRACTICE. By Charles Coppens, S.J.
Revised and enlarged by Henry S. Spalding, S.J. New York:
Benziger Bros.

THIS book consists of a series of lectures delivered to medical students of an American University. The civil laws affecting doctors and their duties form a separate course in every Medical Faculty, and students are carefully instructed on the exact extent of their rights and privileges, according to the law of the land. There is, however, a more fundamental science, which does not always receive proper attention. It is rather vaguely called Medical Jurisprudence, and consists in the application of general ethical principles to the special cases with which a medical practitioner has to deal. It decides whether certain practices are in accordance with the natural law or not, and thereby lays down the basis on which the civil laws touching these subjects must be built.

In the past century medical research has made immense progress and brought into prominence many difficult problems. Ethical science must keep abreast of these developments and draw as clearly as it can the line of demarcation between a lawful and an unlawful operation. The present volume is an attempt to meet the situation.

In the introductory lectures the general principles concerning intention, responsibility, and morality of effects are stated and proved: the author lays strong emphasis on the fact that these truths spring from the natural law, are unchangeable, and independent of civil law. The more important subjects—such as Abortion, Insanity, Sex-hygiene—are then discussed in detail, and the findings are uniformly safe. If there is any marked tendency it is on the side of caution. The author condemns *Twilight Sleep*: but it is hardly yet scientifically established that parturition under an anæsthetic is so dangerous as never to be allowed.

The book is intended primarily for medical students, and a certain degree of technical knowledge is presumed. This is a drawback for the clerical reader, who requires information on details necessary for understanding and judging the different cases. But he will find the book well worth reading and invaluable for the purposes of reference and recommendation. To doctors and nurses a work of this kind is indispensable for their general guidance on the many important questions of morality that will confront them in their professional duties.

As the lectures were delivered to students of different religions, great care has been taken to make the Catholic position quite clear: the ability of the exposition and defence is beyond praise. The style is direct and energetic; there is strength and assurance in every line. We recommend this book as very readable and as one that meets an urgent and important need.

M. J. B.

EVOLUTION AND SOCIAL PROGRESS. By Joseph Husslein, S.J., D.Ph.
London: Harding and More, Ltd.

FATHER HUSSLEIN is one of the most prominent Catholic writers on social questions in America. He is convinced that social unrest has its roots in the prevalent irreligion, while irreligion is, in turn, the outcome of the materialistic evolution that is spread broadcast from platform, press, and university rostrum. In this book he examines evolution in its scientific and philosophic aspects: his object is not speculative, it is eminently practical. Men, nowadays, believe either in God or in materialistic evolution. Nor merely religion, but morality, order, public well-being, the existence of society, depend on the choice.

He shows that materialistic evolution is not science: it is a philosophic dogmatism, based on prejudice rather than ascertained fact. Examined as philosophy it is in open contradiction with reason. What is scientific in it is a hypothesis merely—that certain facts may be best explained so.

This hypothesis is not opposed to religion. It does not exclude creation: quite the contrary, it was propounded by St. Augustine as one of the explanations of God's creative action. Further, the little that science does know about the evolution of the earth is in perfect harmony with one of the several interpretations of the first chapters of Genesis. The hypothesis works only within a restricted field and does not touch on the triple creation of matter, life, and soul. But what about the

human body? Father Husslein goes into the data and finds that while the evolution of the body, if proved, is not irreconcilable with revelation, it is not proved. His conclusions are striking: if the facts support evolution at all, it is an evolution of the ape from man, not man from the ape. Man has not progressed unaided from savagery to civilization: history gives no instance of it; but history is eloquent on man's degeneration from civilization to savagery.

The author concludes: 'Materialistic evolution, from which spring all the civic distempers of the day, from Bolshevism to profiteering, is not based on science. Science confirms religion, on which alone the social fabric can be founded.'

Father Husslein bases his proofs, not on direct examination of the scientific data, which would be almost impossible in a short book on such a subject, but on judicious quotations from the works of leading scientists. Special training is required to estimate the precise bearing of the physical phenomena, while everyone can appreciate the reasoned judgment of an expert and feel its force, especially if the expert be of the opposite camp. The book is therefore free from cumbrous weight of detail and involved argument: it provides a popular and readable critique of evolution that priests can safely recommend to inquiring minds. Most of all, it is a vigorous protest against the perversion of science to serve an irreligious propaganda. Those who are interested in public welfare will find this book thought-compelling.

The printing and *format* of the book is excellent, and reflects credit on the publishers.

M. J. B.

PRAYER: THE GREAT MEANS OF SALVATION. By St. Alphonsus de Liguori. New Edition. Edited by Rev. J. B. Coyle, C.S.S.R., St. Joseph's, Dundalk.

ST. ALPHONSUS' opinion of this little work of his is well known and often quoted: 'I have published several spiritual works,' he says, 'but I do not think that I have written a more useful work than the present. I cannot do it,' he adds, 'but if I could, I would have as many copies of this little book printed as there are faithful on earth, and I would give each a copy, so that everyone might understand the necessity there is for all to pray in order to be saved.' The Rev. Editor's wish in publishing this new edition is to realize, as far as he can, the desires of his saintly Founder. The work is well printed on fine paper, the volume is of convenient size for the pocket, and the price, which varies according to the quality of the binding, is very moderate. Copies may be obtained direct from the Editor.

GOD'S WONDER BOOK. By Marie St. E. Ellerker, O.S.D. London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne.

THE Missal is 'God's Wonder Book,' and the object of the present little treatise is to unfold the meaning of the liturgical prayers and

actions at Mass. The style of writing is accommodated to children, but the substance of the instructions will benefit all who desire to obtain a simple and clear explanation of the beautiful words and ceremonies of the Great Sacrifice. At the end of each chapter a note is added describing the peculiarities observable in the Dominican rite

BOOKS, ETC., RECEIVED.

America : A Catholic Review (March).

The Ecclesiastical Review (March). U.S.A.

The Rosary Magazine (March). Somerset, Ohio.

The Catholic World (March). New York.

The Austral Light (February). Melbourne.

The Ave Maria (March). Notre Dame, Indiana.

The Catholic Bulletin (March). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.

The Irish Monthly (March). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.

The Month (March). London : Longmans.

Études (March). Paris : 12 Rue Oudinot (VII^e).

Revue Pratique d'Apologétique (March). Paris : Beauchesne.

The Fortnightly Review (March). St. Louis, Mo.

The Lamp (March). Garrison, N.Y.

Revue des Jeunes (March). Paris : 3 Rue de Luynes.

The Home World. By F. X. Doyle, S.J. New York : Benziger.

Short Sermons on the Epistles and Gospels of the Sundays of the Year.

By Rev. F. P. Hickey, O.S.B. London : Burns, Oates & Washbourne.

The 'Summa Theologica' (Part II. QQ. LXX.-C.) Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. London : Burns, Oates and Washbourne.

THE MEANING OF THE MASS

BY REV. GARRETT PIERSE, D.D.

A RECENT work of Father de la Taille¹ is suggestive of the days of de Lugo and of Suarez. We may have thought that the age of large tomes was gone for ever, that they had given way to the more portable books of modern times. But Father de la Taille gives us a not altogether unpleasant surprise; he endeavours to bring back the heroic old world in which quartos were not meant to be merely consulted, but to be read to a finish. He presents us with a book that is as large as the largest new Missal, and he has recourse to double columns in his 663 pages. There is one innovation in the old-time theological tome; this treatise is illustrated. Representing the Eucharistic Sacrifice and its prototypes, several noble pictures reproduce works of great artists, and they give us a more exalted idea and feeling concerning the august subject than could be given by reams of print.

But it is not merely in form that this recent book resembles the works of the great masters. The subject is discussed with a wealth of erudition that reminds one of the golden age of the Schools. There is a fresh and comprehensive synthesis of the traditional data. There is displayed, also, a vigour of view that is much needed in an age which is the heir of the agnostic philosophy of the nineteenth century and which is still troubled with a mania of doubt.

The author begins with a trenchant attack on various theories of sacrifice. He does not spare even the widely accepted view of his fellow-Jesuit, de Lugo, that sacrifice requires in every instance a destruction of the victim. The history of sacrifices, Christian, Jewish, and Gentile, does not

¹ *Mysterium Fidei, De Augustissimo Corporis et Sanguinis Christi Sacrificio et Sacramento Elucidationes L.* Paris: Beauchesne et Cie, Éditeurs. 50 frs. net.

warrant the inference that this is an essential element of every sacrifice. For Jew and Gentile had food-offerings; and the most that can be said is that these were made sacred by being set aside from human use and dedicated to God. True, in most cases, destruction was the most convenient way of expressing this fact. Father de la Taille holds the reasonable view that the slaying of the victim is required only in the case of propitiatory sacrifices, but it is difficult to believe that pagans had in mind the symbolism which he attributes to the rite, namely, expression of the mortification of passion. He is on firmer ground when he rejects the view of de Lugo that the immolation of the victim expresses God's lordship over life and death. It is a negative act which does not represent Him Who is the God of the living, and not of the dead.

Nor are the efforts of those who seek the essential idea of sacrifice in a banquet more successful. There is a crude theory of rationalist historians of religion who claim to find in sacrifice an attempt to give a meal to the gods. The view is summed up by Father Lagrange in a phrase, 'the culinary theory of sacrifice.' If it were true, sacrifice, as he points out, would have disappeared on the appearance of more refined ideas concerning the Deity. Yet sacrifice has a persistent vitality amid almost all religious beliefs, with a few exceptions, like Buddhism and Protestantism; and even Protestants hold the belief that Christ offered an all-sufficient sacrifice on the Cross.

A banquet theory of sacrifice was advocated in recent times by some Catholics, for example, Renz and Bellord. Although essentially different from the previous crude view, it has been found unsatisfactory. Bishop Bellord supposed that the essence of sacrifice is to be found in the communion. Apart from the common objection that in this view the Eucharistic Sacrifice would be consummated, not on the altar, but within the body of the celebrant, it can be urged that there were sacrifices such as the holocaust in which there was no communion or banquet.

The most modern rationalist theory no longer finds the

explanation of sacrifice in a meal. It is voiced by M. Loisy in his work on sacrifice.¹ The theory supposes that sacrifice must be classified as a form of magic. It is alleged to be an attempt to reach the gods by an easy short cut. But this view presupposes the materialist theory of evolution. If we set aside this unproved postulate of rationalism, and if we accept the Christian, or even the pagan, idea of God as the Giver of all good gifts, we can form a theory simpler, more direct, and more worthy of the best elements of human nature.

A child's attitude towards a parent suggests the best parable of the psychology of sacrifice. The infant instinctively acknowledges the parent's goodness by a return of little gifts. The instinct has its roots in the depths of nature, not only human nature, but even the nature of the dumb beasts that are not slow to express some recognition of a master's kindness. It may be that the little things offered by the child are worthless in themselves; yet they are welcome, for they represent the best of gifts, the spontaneous love of the human heart. A similar instinct of nature, approved by positive religions, suggests the offering of gifts to the Author of all goodness. God does not, indeed, need our gifts, but we need to offer them to Him; even if worthless in themselves, they represent the sincere act of worship implied by love. A naive conception of sacrifice, it may be said. But it can be said only by a proud criticism which has encumbered the notion of sacrifice with learned subtleties. The taunt can be made only by those who do not recall the precept of Jesus that in religious matters men should become as little children. If men in modern times are inclined to forget the duty of offering gifts to the common Father, in the beginning it was not so. We are reminded in the Canon of the Mass that in the beginnings of the human race there was the naive, childlike attitude towards God, the Giver of all gifts, and that He was pleased to accept the offerings of His child, Abel.

¹ *Essai historique sur le sacrifice*; Paris, 1920.

This simple psychology of sacrifice reveals why sacrifice is the chief act of religion. The whole world was created to manifest the bounty of God. What is inarticulate in the lower creation, becomes articulate in the Priest. He has been called by the Fathers the Tongue of the mystical body of Christ. He is, also, the Tongue of all nature. He consciously confesses the graciousness of God, and he fulfils his sublime mission by offering God His own gifts with a return of thanks. Not without reason, then, is the pure offering of the New Law called a Eucharistic Sacrifice. Unlike Father de la Taille, we prefer to place the primary motive of all sacrifice in a thank-offering. The other principal ends are implied therein. In the liturgical act of thanking God we acknowledge Him to be the Source of good ; we adore Him. We also impetrate Him. He Who is the Giver of all past gifts can be confidently expected to give future ones. Propitiation is also involved ; for the loving return of thanks to the bounteous Author makes men pleasing to God, appeasing Him for their faults.

It is because the Jews sometimes forgot these inner ends of sacrifice and lost themselves in the multitude of external rites that their offerings became displeasing to God. The prophets and psalmists thundered against this abuse, and reminded priest and people of the inner, and only valuable, purpose of sacrifice and of religion ; they dwelt on the need of loving-kindness towards God and His children. ' I will have graciousness rather than sacrifice ' is the law which is resumed by Christ.

These considerations enable us to give a summary description of sacrifice. It is the outward sign of man's inner graciousness towards God. The mere external sign is vain, if its inner meaning is lost : Christ bade His disciples to forego the gift intended for the altar, and be first reconciled with a brother with whom they might have been at enmity. To cover a relative as well as an absolute sacrifice, and to embrace both its internal and external character, a fuller description may be attempted in these words : Sacrifice is the visible offering of a gift that is dedicated to God

and presented by an authorized minister to acknowledge His supreme bounty and to appease Him. There is need of a visible offering. For a sacrifice, like a sacrament, belongs to the class of symbols, or external signs, which suit a nature that is corporeal as well as spiritual, social as well as individual. Christ constantly spoke through symbols, and in this way He still speaks in sacraments and sacrifice.

If one accepts this explanation of sacrifice one has less difficulty in understanding how the Last Supper and the Mass are strict sacrifices. One is no longer obsessed with the idea that a physical destruction of the victim enters into the essence of every repetition of sacrifice. If such were the case, the theologian would be driven to the limits of his ingenuity in explaining the sacrificial character of either the Last Supper or the Mass. It is hard to hold with even de Lugo's attenuated view of sacrificial destruction in the Eucharist, namely, that Christ is placed *in statu decliviori*. For there is a pregnant phrase of St. Thomas which has been adopted by the Church in her liturgy: 'Nec status nec statura signati minuitur.' The most that might be said is that there is not a physical, but a mystic or symbolic destruction of the victim within the Eucharist. According to the thought of St. Paul the celebration of this rite shows forth the death of the Lord until such time as He comes in glory; thus the separate consecrations, representing the separation of Christ's body and blood, are most probably required for the validity of the sacrifice. In accordance with Pauline doctrine, Blessed Peter Canise describes the Mass as 'Dominicae passionis . . . repraesentatio atque simul . . . oblatio.'¹

This explanation throws light on the use of the present tense in the Greek, and of the less exact future tense in the Vulgate version of the words of institution referring to the shedding of Christ's blood. Both tenses insinuate a truth. Our Lord's Blood was mystically shed at the institution of the Eucharist, and the symbolism of the separate consecrations

¹ *Opus Catechisticum de Sacramentis*, q. 7.

represented the future physical shedding of blood on the Cross. Father de la Taille suggests that the Last Supper contained the formal liturgical rite by which Christ there and then devoted Himself to God as the Victim of the Cross. It is, indeed, unquestioned that the Last Supper looked forward to Calvary, and the Mass looks back to the Cross as to a supreme sacrifice, all-sufficient in itself. But Father de la Taille does not seem happy in his language when he describes the Eucharistic Sacrifice as ‘*oblatio victimae aut immolandae aut immolatae*.’ Granted that the Last Supper contained a reference to the future bloody immolation of the Cross, was it not itself a sacrifice with a *Victim* already present, already immolated. Accordingly, we prefer to use the traditional language adopted and sanctioned by the Council of Trent when it spoke of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as containing in itself an immolation? According to the Council¹ the Mass is itself a sacrifice; it is not an empty commemoration of Calvary, but contains an offering of Christ’s body and blood really present. ‘In this divine sacrifice of the Mass there is contained and immolated in an unbloody manner the same Christ Who offered Himself in a bloody manner on the altar of the Cross.’² Pope Leo XIII wrote in a similar sense in his Encyclical, *Mirae Caritatis*: ‘The Eucharist is no empty and bare memorial of His death, but its true and wonderful renewal, though bloodless and mystic.’ This is how St. Thomas explains how the Mass is an immolation:—

For two reasons the celebration of this sacrament is called an immolation of Christ: first, because, as Augustine says to Simplicianus (lib. 2, q. 3), ‘Likenesses are wont to be called by the names of the persons they represent, as, when we look at a picture and say, “That is Cicero, and that other is Sallust.”’ Now, the celebration of this sacrament, as has been said already (q. 79, art. 1), is a representative image of Christ’s Passion which contained His true immolation. Hence Ambrose says concerning the Epistle to the Hebrews (cap. 10): ‘In Christ a victim was offered once, efficacious for eternal salvation. What about us, then? Do we not offer every day? Yes, in memory of His death.’ Secondly, the celebration of this sacrament is called an immolation of Christ by a reference to the effect of His Passion. For through

¹ Sess. 22.² *Ibid.*

this sacrament we partake of the fruit of the Lord's Passion. And so in the Secret of a certain Sunday Mass it is said, 'As often as the commemoration of this victim is celebrated, the work of our redemption is wrought.' In the first way Christ could be said to be immolated even in the figures of the Old Testament; hence it is said in the Apocalypse (cap. 13): 'Whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb that was killed from the beginning of the world.' But in the second way it is peculiar to this sacrament that Christ is immolated in its celebration.¹

We can take it, then, that along with the Eucharistic representation of the Lord's death there is a real offering of the Lord's Passion, an offering of the one eternal Victim made by the eternal Priest, since Christ commissioned the priests of His Church to do what He did in the Last Supper, He, the High Priest, acts through His ministers. The Mass is numerically one with the Cross in Priest and Victim and effects; it is different in the bloodless manner of offering. It is easy, then, to dispose of the Protestant misrepresentation that the Mass is derogatory to the Cross; it is no more derogatory than Baptism, which, as Protestants admit, applies the fruits of the Cross; it no more dishonours Calvary than the pure stream dishonours the unfailing spring which is its source.

Since Christ ordered His disciples to celebrate the Eucharist in memory of Himself, there must be numerous offerings of the Lord's Passion down to the end of time. Each one applies anew the fruits of the Cross; in each one the priest brings his chalice to the wounded side of Christ, and the work of redemption is continued. It is difficult, therefore, to defend the view of many eminent theologians that one Mass offered for an individual is as efficacious as one hundred. Though the Mass, being one with Calvary in the ways mentioned, is infinite in itself, the measure of its application depends not only on the dispositions of the faithful, but on the good pleasure of God. The sense of the faithful, who have several Masses celebrated for the same individual, is a decisive argument against the opposing view. And the sense of the faithful is the sense of the

¹ *Summa Theol.*, Pars. 3, q. 83, a. 1.

Pope, who encourages priests to offer a number of Masses on the day of commemoration of all the faithful departed.

Establishing the triple unity of the Last Supper, the Sacrifice of the Cross and the Mass, theologians invoke the aid of history. And in criticizing the early documents Father de la Taille is not quite so successful as in the scholastic portions of his work. For he does not take account of the principle of doctrinal development, generally admitted by modern writers since the days of Cardinal Newman. A brief examination of the doctrine of the earlier writers will help to illustrate a view which holds the mean between a defence of every statement of individual Fathers and an equally one-sided contention that they denied the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The latter extreme was advocated in recent times by a German priest, Dr. Wieland, of Dillingen, in his brochure, *Mensa und Confessio*, which alleges that Fathers preceding Irenæus were not only unconscious of any objective offering in the Eucharist, but opposed the doctrine and held that prayers and similar subjective offerings were the only sacrifices of Christians. Let the Fathers themselves speak, those of the second and third centuries down to the end of the period of St. Cyprian, when, even according to Harnack's *History of Dogma*, the doctrine of an objective sacrifice in the Eucharist was firmly believed.

St. Justin Martyr speaks concerning those 'sacrifices which are offered to God in every place by us, Gentiles, *that is*, the bread of the Eucharist and similarly the cup of the Eucharist.'¹ Irenæus, who saw Polycarp, the disciple of St. John, wrote: 'There were oblations there (among the Jews), and oblations here (among the Christians).'² Elsewhere he wrote: 'And the cup likewise, which is part of the creation to which we belong, He confessed to be His blood, and taught the new oblation of the new covenant—which the Church, *receiving from the Apostles*, offers to God, throughout all the world, to Him who gives us the

¹ Dialogue with Tryphon, 41.

² Adv. Haer. iv. 18, 2.

means of sustenance—the first-fruits of His own gifts in the New Testament, concerning which Malachy . . . spoke beforehand.’¹ Clement of Alexandria speaks of ‘heresies which employ bread and water *in the oblation*, not according to the rule of the Church.’² Origen testifies that the Christians eat that bread which is offered with prayers and thanksgivings.³ Tertullian says that ‘Mithra also (like the Church) celebrates the oblation of bread.’⁴ Hippolytus of Rome says : ‘If the anti-Christ appears, the *food and drink offering* is removed which already is offered to God by the Gentiles in all parts of the world.’⁵ St. Cyprian asks : ‘Who more a priest than Jesus Christ, who offered a sacrifice to God the Father, and offered the very same thing which Melchisedech had offered, that is, bread and wine, to wit, His body and blood?’⁶ ‘Some, either through ignorance or simplicity, in consecrating the Cup of the Lord do not that which Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, the *Teacher and Founder* of this sacrifice, did and taught.’⁷ Cyprian speaks of offerings for the dead as of a well-established practice. ‘If anyone should do this, no offering should be made for him nor should any sacrifice be celebrated for his repose. For he does not deserve to be named at God’s altar in the prayers of the priests.’⁸ Cyprian’s great master, Tertullian, had already testified : ‘We make offerings in behalf of the dead, for their anniversaries.’⁹

Any reasonable critic, one who can entertain ideas contrary to his preconceived opinions, may decide whether the general tenor of this evidence signifies the existence of a strict, objective sacrifice in the Eucharist. Would Irenæus, who believed in a new oblation, taught by the Apostles and identified with the spotless oblation announced by Malachy, feel at home with the later declarations of Trent concerning the true sacrifice of the Mass? Would Tertullian, who spoke of anniversary offerings for the dead,

¹ Adv. Haer. iv. 17, 5.

² Stromata, i. 19.

³ In Levit., hom. 13.

⁴ De Praescriptione, xv.

⁵ Fragm. in Dan. i. 22; Migne, Gr. x.

⁶ Ep. 63.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ep. i. 2.

⁹ De Carne Christi, 3.

support Protestants and rationalistic critics in regarding as an innovation the dogma of Trent that the Mass should be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, penalties satisfactions, and other needs? ¹ Would St. Cyprian, who expressly said, 'Hence it appears that *the blood of Christ is not offered* if there be no wine in the Cup'; ² and again: 'Christ is bread to those of us *who touch His body*' ³—would he feel less at home with the sacrificial doctrine of the Catholic Church than with that of her present-day rivals?

There is, indeed, a development of doctrine among the early writers, so far as we can judge from their scanty references to the Eucharist. From the saying of Irenæus about 'the offering of the first-fruits,' or of Tertullian about the offering of bread, to Cyprian's expression about the offering of Christ's body and blood, there is a notable advance in clearness. If the testimonies in the main are in agreement concerning the essential fact of an objective offering in the Eucharist, we can consider difficult passages with greater confidence. Thus, Clement of Alexandria says that 'the sacrifice of the Church is the word breathing as incense from holy souls,' ⁴ and that 'we do not with reason sacrifice to Him Who is not overcome by pleasure.' ⁵ Inasmuch as we have seen that Clement elsewhere speaks of the use of bread in the Church's oblation, we can take it that he (and we may say the same of other apologists using similar language) did not reject external offerings, but rather excluded the gross sacrifices of pagans, and stressed the spiritual aspect of sacrifice as the all-important one. Justin, it seems, inaccurately places the entire essence of the Eucharistic offering in prayer: he agrees with the Jew, Tryphon, that 'prayers and thanksgivings offered up by the worthy are the only sacrifices which are perfect and acceptable to God,' and he adds that 'these alone the Christians also have been

¹ Sess. 22, can. 3.

² Ep. 63.

³ 'Christus eorum qui corpus ejus contingimus panis est' (*De Dominica Orat.*, 18).

⁴ Stromata, vii. c. 6.

⁵ Ibid. vii. 3.

taught to offer and that in the remembrance made by their food, both solid and liquid, in which there is a commemoration also of the passion endured for their sakes by the Son of God.’¹ But we have seen that, according to Justin, these sacrifices are not altogether internal, for he speaks of ‘the sacrifices offered up in all places, that is, the Bread of the Eucharist and the Cup of the Eucharist.’²

That the earliest Fathers should have taught the doctrine of an external offering in the Eucharist is of great importance. Irenæus wrote about a half century after the death of the last Apostle; Cyprian, the last witness mentioned, wrote a century and a half after the same point of time. Both are very conservative writers. They do not teach their own thoughts, but the early tradition. Irenæus says that the Church received the oblation from the Apostles; Cyprian testifies that the Lord is its Teacher. These are strong testimonies concerning the purity of that early tradition, which is also the present-day doctrine of the Catholic Church alone. As guides concerning the earliest and purest doctrine, the Fathers of the second and third centuries are surely preferable to critics of the twentieth.

GARRETT PIERSE.

¹ Dialogue 116, 117.

² Ibid, 41.

ETERNAL LIFE

BY THE BISHOP OF SEBASTOPOLIS

(*Concluded*)

Out of the shadows of sadness
Into the sunshine of gladness,
Into the light of the blest ;
Out of a land very dreary,
Into the rapture of rest.

Into a joyland above us,
Where there's a Father to love us—
Into our Home—Sweet Home.

—FATHER RYAN.

IT has often been said—and there seems no reason to doubt the statement—that if we could carry off even the very worst and most hardened and inveterate sinner,¹ and place him for a while on the brink of the bottomless pit of hell, and let him see for himself, with his own eyes, all the unspeakable horrors and all the excruciating torments reserved for criminals like himself, he would be so absolutely terrified and so deeply moved and alarmed at the sight, that he would instantly change his evil ways, give up sin, and begin to lead the life of a saint. One glimpse of hell would so burn itself into his memory, that it would never be forgotten.¹

The thought of those lurid fires would haunt him night

¹ St. Teresa was once granted a vision of hell, and it haunted her for years. Fully six years after the terrific experience she wrote, as follows, to a friend : ' I was terrified by that vision, and that *terror is on me even now while I am writing* ; and though it took place six years ago, the natural warmth of my body is chilled by fear even now. And so, amid all the pain and suffering which I may have had to bear, I remember no time in which I do not think that, by comparison, all we have to suffer in this world is as nothing. It seems to me that we complain, without reason ' (vide *Life*, written by herself, chap. xxxii. p. 267).

and day ; the distorted limbs of the damned, writhing under their eternal tortures, would be ever before his eyes ; the crackling of the flames, the gnashing of teeth, and the piercing shrieks and deafening yells of agony ever in his ears. He would start and tremble at the bare shadow of sin whenever it crossed his path ; and would fly from temptation as from the face of a fiery serpent. In fact, he would spend the rest of his days in the exercise of heroic virtue. And, observe, he would be moved to do this, not because of any new truth that had been revealed to him, but solely because he had been brought to realize and to understand, for the first time, all the horrors and frightful meanings of *an old truth, familiar to him from childhood*, namely, that hell itself is awaiting the impenitent sinner, to torment him, in inextinguishable fires, for ever and ever. For, to believe is one thing, but to realize is quite another. And hell realized is a most powerful motive.

This is, no doubt, true. But, after all, man is so constituted, that he is found to be just as strongly attracted by rewards as he is repelled by punishments ; and perhaps even more so. The experience of past ages proves that even the poor and unworthy pleasures of this earth allure him to destruction, quite as effectually as the candle allures the moth. Just think of the millions and millions who give way to sins of the flesh ; millions and millions who deliberately run the risk of eternal damnation, the loss of Heaven, and the friendship and love of God Himself, for the sake of the enjoyment, the *momentary* enjoyment, of a forbidden pleasure. O ! If the weak and sordid pleasures of this world hold such a despotic sway, and exert such a tremendous influence over men, what would be the strength and the influence of the exquisite delights of Heaven, if only they could be realized ? There are many things that lead men to commit sin, but it is the strong desire for pleasure, more than for anything else, that possesses this awful power. We have just referred, as an example, to sins of the flesh. Pause for a moment and

reflect, that in this case, though men are invited to break the Law of God, yet they are offered nothing substantial; nothing of permanent value, in return. No; nothing more than a little sensual pleasure, which can be enjoyed but for a moment. Yet, even that attracts them, as the magnet attracts steel. They will seek this indulgence with the greatest assiduity, nor do they care what extravagant price they pay for it. Thousands have ruined their health, sacrificed their reputation, lost good situations, and faced disgrace rather than deny themselves even the lowest animal pleasure, once placed within their reach. Nay more, many, as though rendered desperate and reckless and maddened by the very vehemence of their desire, have turned their backs upon God Himself, forfeited Heaven, and have braved the eternal torments of hell, *to which they knew they were exposing themselves*, rather than forego the low and shameful gratification of a moment.

Other temptations attract men by offering them a great variety of different things, but things, at least, of some reputed value, such as wealth, position, success in business, the removal of a rival, the death of an enemy, and so forth; but sins of the flesh have nothing to offer but a momentary sensual pleasure; a brief sensible delight. Yet this notwithstanding, the prospect of this miserable and sordid pleasure is found to exercise a far more powerful influence over men, than the prospect of higher and much more substantial gains. The fact is, that men are more allured by pleasure, poor though it may be, and are more readily won over and captivated by it, than by anything else which other temptations have to offer as the reward of disobedience.

Alas, it is but too well known, that so strong is its attraction, and so deadly is its fascination, that more are drawn down to hell, *by this one sin*, not merely than by any other, but *terrible dictu*, than by *all other sins put together*. This was the deliberate opinion of such a wise and such an experienced old saint as St. Alphonsus,

and is the common opinion of most spiritual writers of to-day.¹

Now, my argument is this : If base and degrading and purely earthly pleasures such as these, can and do actually exercise so extraordinary a power over men, surely the thought, and still more the well-founded hope, of the immeasurably higher and intenser and more gratifying and enduring pleasures of Heaven, should not only quench all sinful lust for earthly pleasures, and dull their attraction, but should fill every thoughtful man with disgust and horror for earthly joys and with an immense appreciation of heavenly ones, together with an insatiable desire for their attainment. Hence, Heaven assiduously contemplated, Heaven thoughtfully considered and meditated, should prove a most powerful and almost irresistible stimulus. Its sounds and scenes, so infinitely superior to any to be met with on earth, its peace and rest and perfect tranquillity, its beauty and splendour and loveliness, so far surpassing even our wildest dreams ; the society of Angels and Saints, and of the three Persons of the Blessed Trinity, and the complete absence of all that could molest, or disturb, or trouble the heart or mind, together with the most perfect satisfaction of every sense of the body and of every power of the soul, would draw our hearts as nothing else ever could, and would excite within them a thirst that nothing else could satisfy. And the more the mind dwelt upon these infinite joys and delights, and the more it familiarized itself with them, the more intense and the more irresistible would become the hunger and the thirst for Heaven and all that Heaven means. The whole soul would yearn, with an incredible impatience, for the 'Courts of the Lord.' It would desire them before all things, and would cheerfully

¹ Speaking of the Sixth and the Ninth Commandments, St. Alphonsus introduces the subject, in the following terrible words : '*Utinam brevius aut obscurius explicare me potuissem. Sed cum sit frequentior ac abundantior confessionum materia et propter quam major animarum numerus ad infernum dilabatur, imo non dubito asserere ob hoc unum impudicitiae vitium, aut saltem non sine eo, omnes damnari quicumque damnantur, etc.*' (vide *Theologia* ; Tractus de sexto et nono Decalogi Praecepto, p. 215).

pay any price and accept any condition, so that it might one day really come to enjoy such an entrancingly happy existence.

However, in order that the thought of Heaven should produce its full effect upon me, and prove a really powerful motive, four conditions are essential. In the *first* place, I must realize, in some measure, the magnitude of the reward that is offered, and fully persuade myself that it exceeds, in an immeasurable degree, anything that eye has ever seen, or ear has ever heard, or intellect ever conceived. In the *second* place, I must fully acknowledge to myself that this reward is prepared for, and is destined *for me*. And in the *third* place, I must clearly understand and bring home to myself, that this tremendous and wholly unspeakable treasure is placed, in very truth, actually within my reach, and that it not only *may*, but that it most undoubtedly *will be mine*, if only I love God and keep His commandments. In the *fourth* place, I must live my daily life, in the full consciousness that I am ever hastening towards this great object of my desire, day by day, and without a single moment's cessation, and that each hour and each moment is really bringing me a step nearer to this Home of supreme and infinite joy, and furthermore that it is possible even that I may be called at any unexpected moment to enter into 'the joy of the Lord.'

If these four conditions are ever present before the mind, and if they are allowed to exert their full influence on the soul, they will produce a wonderful change in any individual, however he may be circumstanced. They will set him furiously thinking, planning, and arranging so as to render his possession of the heavenly prize as secure as possible. They will so draw his affections towards the Goal, that he will be prepared to suffer anything and to do anything in order to reach it. They will so arouse his desires, that he will most willingly and most readily follow the narrow way, and the straight path, that leads to Heaven, and would be ready to do so with equal earnestness, even were it a thousand times harder and more

painful than it really is. In fact, with his exalted conception of the delights of Heaven, he would consider them very cheaply won *at any price whatsoever*. But, when he realizes how exceedingly little is really demanded of him, and how, in sober truth, God offers him His heavenly Kingdom (and all that is involved in the term) for doing merely his duty, he makes up his mind, with the firmest determination, never to be wanting or remiss in performing it; but to discharge his simple obligations with the utmost accuracy and diligence.

Again and again, with his mind's eye, he contemplates the beauteous Heaven above, 'the Land of the Living' (Ez. xxxii. 25), 'the Place of God's Glory' (Is. lxiii. 15), 'the Everlasting Kingdom' (2 Pet. ii. 4), 'the Promised Land' (Heb. xii. 22), 'the Paradise of God' (Ap. ii. 7), and the 'New Jerusalem' (Ap. xxi. 2), and he knows that within the hallowed walls of that 'City of the Lord of Hosts' (Ps. xlvii. 9) there is gathered every conceivable happiness, and every conceivable delight. What would he not give to be able to throw open the golden gates, and to enter! His heart is stirred to its uttermost depths. He knows that he was created on purpose to enjoy and possess God for all eternity. He feels the attraction; every fibre of his being vibrates with impatience to be with God. His whole nature is strongly drawn towards Him. He hears the divine words: 'Sponsabo te in sempiternum' (Osee ii. 19), and his whole soul thrills with delight. He understands there is no rest and that there can be no rest, until he can be united with God, and pass within the 'Sanctuary of the Lord' (Dan. xxvi. 15). But how is this to be accomplished? where will he find the golden key, with which he may open the gates of Paradise? He soon learns that the golden key hangs well within the reach of his hands, and that he has only to desire it, in order to make it his own. What is that key? It is Sanctity; it is Freedom from sin; it is Innocence of life. This key will open every lock, though no other will turn in one of its wards. 'He that doth the will of My Father, who is in

Heaven, he shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven' (Matt. vii. 21).

So soon as Heaven becomes a reality to us, so soon as we live with this glorious vision ever before our eyes, our present life becomes invested with a new interest; we feel that we are actually building up our future abode, that it will be what we make it; that every day we are (*whether consciously or unconsciously*) adding something to its beauty or else diminishing in some degree its splendour and magnificence, and that it is the one supreme and important reality, to be secured at any price, and to be struggled for with unending perseverance. *It is all the more important* to realize all this, because we may, otherwise, soon grow cold and lethargic, and even forfeit our right to eternal life altogether; for, though 'many are called, yet but few are chosen.' There is no doubt whatsoever but that God wishes all men to be saved. This momentous and consoling truth is clearly enunciated, in many passages, both in the Old and the New Testament. Thus, to quote a single text from each. Ezechiel writes: 'As I live, saith the Lord, I desire not the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn away from his evil way and live' (xxxiii. 11). And what Ezechiel says, under the Old Dispensation, St. Peter says, under the New, in almost identical terms: 'God willeth not that any one should perish, but that ALL should return to penance' (2 Peter iii. 9).

And, furthermore, as an earnest of the sincerity of His will, that all should be saved, He has made the conditions of salvation exceedingly easy in themselves, and placed them fully within the easy reach of Catholics. Yet, in spite of this, the general opinion seems to be that the majority of *adult* Catholics are lost? Fra E. da Chitignano, O.S.F., in his book, entitled *L'Uomo in Paradiso* (p. 269), writes: 'St. Jerome, St. Augustine, St. Basil, St. John Chrysostom, St. Ephrem, St. Gregory the Great, and St. Anselm, and many more most learned men, of the highest virtue, have held the opinion that the majority of adult Catholics are condemned to hell for all eternity.' He also

says that, 'Even Suarez, who expresses the opposite opinion (*il quale è di contrario parere*), confesses that the more common opinion is against him.'

The opinion of such Saints and learned Doctors of the Church is worthy of respect, and deserves to be remembered, and it would be quite out of place for me to express any view in conflict with theirs. But this much I will venture to say, viz., that, as a result of over fifty years of reading, writing, reflecting, and experience, I feel I may lay down the following two propositions, *as undoubtedly true*: (1) It is easy for any Catholic to be saved, who is really in earnest; (2) And, it is easy and very easy for any Catholic to be lost, who is not in earnest—who is careless and indifferent. It is not wise to be too sure about our own salvation. The very sense of insecurity is by no means a bad thing. It ensures caution and watchfulness, and will compel us to avoid, as far as possible, the dangerous occasions of sin. 'He that thinketh himself to stand, let *him* take heed, lest he fall' (1 Cor. x. 12). Consequently, it is just as well to take into account and to allow some weight to the more alarming, yet deliberate view, of the great Saints and Doctors quoted above. For it will set any prudent man thinking and pondering over the best means of rendering his salvation more and more secure.

I—VENIAL SIN

Let us consider a few of these means, as laid down by spiritual writers and teachers. In the first place, we must conceive the most lively appreciation of the inexpressible malice of sin, especially of venial sin. Not, of course, that venial sin can be compared to mortal sin in malice, but merely on the principle that if we are ever at pains to avoid what is venial, we shall certainly avoid what is mortal. It is really an application of the business principle: 'Look after the pence, and the pounds will look after themselves.' Hate venial sin with all the power of your will, and you will hate mortal sin with still greater intensity, and will never allow it to

approach. Guard yourself from the lesser faults, and the more grievous will never be committed. So far as mortal sin is concerned, we are advised to enter upon a serious and detailed consideration of the various consequences that follow from its commission: to weigh them well, and one *at a time*.

Thus, for instance, on Monday we might meditate on the supreme excellence of sanctifying grace, of which it deprives us.

On Tuesday, on the immense value and the inestimable worth of the treasures of merit, accumulated perhaps for many years, of which it robs us, in an instant.

On Wednesday, on the transcendent glory and happiness of Heaven, of which it despoils us.

On Thursday, on the raging fires of hell, which will never end, to which it exposes us.

On Friday, on the most atrocious agony and death of Jesus Christ, which sin, in some sense, renews, according to the words of St. Paul: '*They crucify again to themselves the Son of God, and make Him a mockery*' (Heb. vi. 6).

On Saturday, on the hideousness of sin in itself; and

On Sunday, on the black ingratitude and mean selfishness that it involves.

The idea is that we should first of all arouse ourselves to a vivid estimation of *each* of these effects, *taken singly*, and then unite them in one tremendous stream, which will overwhelm us, and fill us with the greatest confusion, should we ever find ourselves tampering with temptation, or entering into any negotiation with the fiend.

All spiritual writers, of course, recommend the ordinary means of perseverance, such as the Mass, the Sacraments, Meditation, Mortification, the practice of the Presence of God, devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary, the avoiding of all occasions of sin, and the rest; so there is *no need to dwell upon any of these points*, save in so far as they are treated in some special way. But I will bring to the notice of my benignant reader a few suggestions which are not quite so commonly found in the ordinary treatises.

II—PAINS OF PURGATORY

The first has to do with the doctrine of temporal punishment, endured by the souls in Purgatory. Fra E. da Chitignano lays stress upon the advantages of earnestly considering these sufferings, as nothing will so impress upon us the malice of even venial sin, and the necessity of avoiding the slightest deliberate imperfections. In all these cases, the important thing is to *realize* the dreadful nature of the punishment, and to bring home to ourselves as vividly as possible their agonizing intensity. For, with most of us the flames of Purgatory are little more than painted flames, and hardly move us at all. D. Fra Chitignano is careful to point out that, as a matter of fact, the sufferings of that dreadful prison are worse than anything we have any experience of in this life, and that (as St. Thomas himself teaches ¹) the fire which burns and purifies the holy souls is one and the same as that which torments the damned, in the bottomless pit of hell. He quotes St. Catherine of Genoa as declaring that the souls in Purgatory suffer torments that no tongue can describe, and that no mind can understand, unless God should be pleased to enlighten it, by a special grace. He then quotes St. M. Maddalena dei Pazzi, who, in her raptures, beheld such terrible and such horrible tortures in Purgatory, 'that all the most horrible torments imagined by Dante, and described by him in his *Divina Commedia*, no more resemble those actually existing in Purgatory, than a painted fire resembles a real fire.' ('Sono come il fuoco dipinto paragonato al vero,' p. 298.)

He also puts considerable emphasis upon the enormous length of time that imperfect souls may have to spend amid the expiatorial fires, which may extend to 'millions and millions of centuries.' That Purgatory exists, and that it is a place of temporal suffering is, of course, of divine Faith; but all details as to the degree and as to the length

¹ 'Idem est ignis qui damnatos cruciat in inferno, et qui justos in Purgatorio purgat' (In 4, dist. 20, a. I ad 2, 9).

of these sufferings, is a matter of opinion and of greater or less probability. What canonized Saints have declared they have seen, in vision, must certainly be listened to with respect, and should be taken into account in our meditations, but we should also remember that they do not speak with the infallible voice of the Church, and that they neither possess nor claim her divine authority.

III—HELP THE SUFFERING SOULS

Another very efficacious means of securing a happy eternity is to cultivate a great devotion to the holy souls in Purgatory. By our earnest prayers and Communions and alms and acts of penance offered up on their behalf, we make for ourselves innumerable friends amongst them. Those who have been helped will never forget their benefactors. If we are able to release a number from their fiery prison, and to obtain for them a speedy entrance into Heaven, we know that their gratitude will know no bounds. They will take us under their protection, and never cease praying for us, until we, too, come to join their ranks. They may, of course, intercede for us while they are still detained amid the cleansing flames; but they will do so with immensely greater power after they have been admitted to the Beatific Vision, and this longed-for moment may be very much hastened by our earnest suffrages. St. Leonard of Port Maurice, during his forty-four years of impressive preaching, was often heard to make use of the following argument:—

Listen to me, my beloved brethren, if you wish to enjoy the delights of Paradise, do all you can to help the souls in Purgatory. For, rest assured, that if you succeed in rescuing even but one soul, Paradise is yours. Yes! Yes! Paradise is yours. Why? Well, because that holy soul, whom you have released, will never cease interceding for you, until you join it in Heaven. Do you ask why these souls are so grateful? I will tell you. It is for the self-same reason that men in this world are so ungrateful. Should you confer a benefit upon a man here, you do but whet his appetite, and dispose him to demand further benefits in the future. Why is this? Because any benefit you may confer upon him is but a partial benefit, and cannot satisfy all his wants. There is nothing final about it. But the benefit you confer upon a soul in Purgatory, when you open the gates of Heaven to him, is final and exhaustive, and completely satisfies all his desires for ever more. He

will never ask another benefit. He has every want completely satisfied and every desire gratified. And, as ingratitude is a fault, and quite unknown in Heaven, his one effort will be to obtain for his benefactor a share in his own celestial bliss. He will never fail to intercede for you, and will obtain for you the crowning grace of a death, 'blessed in the sight of God.'

This seems to be a valuable suggestion, and it may be well worth our while to act upon the advice of the Saint, and to endeavour to do more in the future than we have done in the past for our suffering brethren. In that way we shall secure the valuable help of a great many friends before the throne of God and obtain a speedy entrance into Heaven.

IV—INDULGENCES

Another excellent practice, strongly recommended, is that of gaining as many indulgences as possible. Even apart from its direct effect, such a practice exercises an excellent influence upon the soul. It keeps the thought of the punishment of sin before us; and the severe punishment of even venial sin impresses our minds with a deep sense of its great malice and strengthens our will to resist it; and, at the same time, we are satisfying for sins, the guilt of which has been forgiven, and getting into the way of making ejaculatory prayers, which should be practised by all who aspire after perfection. This brings us to the fifth suggestion, viz. :—

V—EJACULATORY PRAYERS

One of the simplest and yet one of the most effective means of sanctifying one's soul, and securing a high place in the Kingdom of Heaven, is the habit of uttering ejaculatory prayers. They are short, they can be said at any time, and in any place; they do not interrupt any occupation on which we may be engaged, and, at the same time they keep the mind occupied with God and divine things, and help us to remain habitually sensible of the presence of God. 'The Fathers attach great importance to these frequent, short aspirations towards God, as being

well suited to form the spirit of prayer. Cassian, in his *Institutions*, says that they think it is better to make short prayers, and to *repeat* them, more frequently. By multiplying these prayers we unite ourselves more intimately to God, and by making them short, we better escape the darts, which the devil hurls against us.' ¹

The venerable Abbot Blossius, an acknowledged authority on such matters, speaks in even stronger terms. He writes: 'The diligent darting forth of aspirations and prayers of ejaculation and fervent desires to God, joined with true mortification and self-denial, is the *most certain* as well as the shortest way by which a soul can easily and quickly come to perfection, And the reason is that aspirations of this kind efficaciously penetrate and surmount all things which are between God and the soul.' ²

Cardinal Vives speaks with almost equal fervour in the same sense. ³

This was certainly the opinion of the saintly Father William Doyle, S.J., the well-known army chaplain, whose *Life* was published in 1920. His biographer tells us that 'it was especially by momentary recollection and ejaculatory prayer that Father Doyle sought to sanctify the passing moment, and to condense perfection into the immediate present. When he was tempted to break a resolution, or when he shrank from some sacrifice, he used to say five times to himself: "Will you refuse to do this for the love of Jesus?" By means of aspirations he sharpened his will into instant action, and brought into play all the accumulated motive-power of the past. . . . He had a wonderful idea of the value of aspirations as a source of grace and merit. "If I knew I should receive one pound

¹ Vide *The Spiritual Life and Prayer*, p. 99.

² Vide *A Book of Spiritual Instruction*, by Blossius, p. 38, chap. v.

³ Card. Vives, O.M., cap., in his *Compendium Theol. Ascetico-Mysticæ*, p. 259, has the following: 'Jam actum est passim de Jaculatoriis orationibus quæ quidem interius exteriusque fieri possunt. Sed nunquam satis adhortari possumus omnes devotos ad illas adhibendas quam frequentissime, præsertim internas quæ faciliores in variis circumstantiis evadunt. Dicit ergo frequenter saltem corde: *Diligam Te Jesu! Fiat voluntas Tua! Coelum! Coelum! O Jesu, quando satiabor in Patria!*—et alia similia.'

sterling for each one I made, I would not waste a spare moment. And yet I get infinitely more than this, though I often fail to realize it." The following are among some of the most beautiful of his favourite aspirations : "My Crucified Jesus, help me to crucify myself. Lord, teach me how to pray, and to pray always. Jesus, Thou Saint of saints, make me a saint. My God, Thou art omnipotent, make me a saint."¹ 'The number of aspirations which he contrived to fit into one day, advanced from 10,000 to over 100,000,' says Alfred O'Rahilly 'though how he was able to make so many remains somewhat of a mystery, for even at the rate of 50 aspirations a minute, it would take over thirty-three hours to make 100,000 ejaculations'!²

If we are intent on fitting ourselves for a place in God's heavenly Kingdom, we shall certainly enter upon this practice of ejaculatory prayers. Besides being a powerful means of advancing, it is so simple and so easy, that it is within the reach of everybody. I will merely say this : in selecting our ejaculations, we shall be wise if we are careful to choose (a) such aspirations as demand some very specially useful grace, and (b) such as are also heavily indulged. The following strikes me as fulfilling, in a high degree, both qualifications, viz., *Sweetest Heart of Jesus, I implore, that I may love Thee ever more and more.*

Here, in the first place, we ask for an *increase of the love of God*, which is of greater spiritual advantage to us than anything else we could possibly ask for. For to increase in God's love, is to increase in sanctity. Love being the very measure of all holiness both in men and in Angels. In the second place, this aspiration carries with it an *indulgence of three hundred days*. If God cannot refuse the earnest and fervent and continual prayer of the just man, think of the effect of this short prayer repeated many thousand times a day. Then reflect also on the continual multiplication of the three hundred days of indulgence, day by day, as the prayer is repeated over and over again,

¹ Vide *Life*, p. 113.

² *Life*, p. 116, by A. O'Rahilly.

for hundreds and thousands of times, and on all sorts of occasions, as when dressing and undressing, when lying awake during the night, when travelling or taking a stroll, or while waiting for penitents, in the confessional, or reading or writing, or conversing with others, for such occupations may always be interrupted, just for an imperceptible moment, to cast a loving glimpse at God, present within us, and to ask Him for a further increase of love.

VI—COMPLIN

Since a happy death is an essential condition of a happy eternity, and as no one can promise himself so great a grace, or know that it will be given him, unless indeed he receive a divine revelation on the subject, it becomes exceedingly necessary to make it a subject of regular and persevering prayer. There can be no doubt whatever but that God will grant us any gift needed to ensure our salvation, if only we ask for it earnestly and to the end. To pray for it daily is, no doubt, to secure it without fail. 'Ask and you shall receive.'

Now, there is no better method of persevering in our prayers for a happy death, than by connecting them, in some way, with our daily recitation of the Breviary. Complin may be offered up, in an especial way, every day of our lives, for this end. Whenever we say: 'Noctem quietam et finem perfectum concedat nobis Dominus omnipotens,' we naturally think of our death. For, what is this 'night,' but the close of the short 'day' of our present life? What is this *night* but the night spoken of by Our Lord, when He said, *The night cometh when no man can work* (John ix. 4). Hence, we pray that this night of death may be 'quiet,' that is to say, peaceful, and free from the anguish of remorse, and from the violent assaults and temptations of the devil. '*Et finem perfectum.*' And the end perfect. The end, that is to say, the final act of our conscious life; the going forth from this world may it be perfect, that is to say, accompanied with all the usual formalities of Viaticum, Extreme Unction, the Last Blessing,

and the rest. Such should be the thoughts in our minds, as we recite the familiar words : ' Noctem quietam et finem perfectum concedat nobis Dominus omnipotens. Amen.'

Such a petition, offered up to God, day after day, as we recite our Office, is certain to secure for us all that is requisite, in our last hour. A prayer, such as this, repeated and repeated with the regularity of the town clock, and persevered in even to our old age, becomes irresistible, and is sure of obtaining grace and mercy and a peaceful and perfect end, when, at last, the Angel of Death is sent to summon us before the Great White Throne, to listen to the solemn sentence, which is to determine our fate for evermore. ' O ! Quando veniam, et apparebo ante faciem Tuam ? Quando satiabor gloria Tua ? Quando totus et totaliter amabo Te, et Te solo fruar ? '

FINIS.

✠ JOHN S. VAUGHAN.

THE GENEALOGY OF ST. PATRICK

BY REV. MICHAEL T. MACSWEENEY

THE following article is an inquiry into the genealogy of St. Patrick, in the light and in support of claims which I advanced in regard to his Roman origin, in dealing with his place of birth.¹

THE TEXTS

As in the previous article, I shall commence by quoting the manual texts.

I

Ego Patritius . . . patrem habui Calpornum diaconum filium quendam Potiti² presbyteri qui fuit uico bannaum Taberniae uillulam enim prope habuit.³

II

1. Genair Patraicc innemthur ised atfet hiscelaib maccan sembliadan deac intan dobreth foderaib.
2. Succat aainm itubrad ced aathair ba fissi macc alpuirn maic otide hoadeochain odissi.
3. Bai se bliadna ifognam maisse dōine nistoi mled batar ile cothraige cethartrebe diafognad.
4. Asbert Victor frigni ad milcon tessad fortonna forruib achois forsindleicc maraid aaes nibronna.
5. Dofaid tarelpa huile de mair ba amra retha Conidfargaib lagerman andes indeisciurt lethas.⁴

III

Patricius filius alpruind m hoddage m hoddisse m Corniul m liberiud m meruit m hoda m orice m muric m leo m maxime m encreti m erise m peliste m farine m britain a quo bretnaig m fergus leithdeirg m nemid m agnomain m paim m thait m shera m sru m esrú m pramint m aithechta m magoc m iafeth m noei m lamiach.

Cochmas vero ingen ochmuissi do frangeuib matair patraic agus siur do martain hi iarfir Do macuib israel tra iarfir do patraice. act dia rohes-

¹ I. E. RECORD, April, 1918.

² 'filii odissi,' in margin.

³ *Codex Ardm.*, ed. Dr. Gwynn, p. [43].

⁴ Hymn of Fiecc, ap. Zimmer, *Kelt. Stud.*, ii. 163.

reteá maice israél o thid agus o vespiain, in dí consul rómanaig fo cech aird in domain ándigail fola criost. isand doriacht bunad patraic co bretnu. Conid airesin atberar bretnach de ar a taideacht andaire innte.

Succait tra ainm baitse patraic.

Cotraige vero aainm ándoire. inand on agus fer no fógnad do cethrair inoenfecht, mogonius aainm oca foglaimm. Patricius aainm la romanchu.

Succait (ut dixi) aainm baiste iar mbuaid cotraige a ndóire dimbuain Patritius illetha a luind. Magónius cafgluimm. is iarum roíl cretium anerinn agus roindairb demnu esti.¹

IV

Patraice *m* Calpuirn *m* Fodaighe *m* Oduis *m* Coirniuil *m* Liber *m* Mercuit *m* Oda *m* Oricc *m* Muricc *m* Oirce *m* Leo *m* Maxim *m* Otraice *m* Erise *m* Peliste *m* Ferine *m* Briotáin *m* Ferghasa leithderce *m* Nemhidh *m* Agnamain.²

REMARKS ON THE TEXTS

A

No. I is a purely Latin document; II a purely Irish document; III a typical composite pedigree, embodying various traditions, from the *Leabhar Breac*; IV is the Four Masters' pedigree, which we may accept as a fairly complete final synthesis of the various documents and traditions.

B

Nos. I and II are the ultimate texts which form the basis of this study. Nos. III and IV introduce the names of St. Martin, of Conchessa, the reputed mother of St. Patrick and relative of St. Martin, mention of a Jewish strain in St. Patrick, and of names which, for reasons given later, I well set down as Cornelius, Liberius, Leo, Maximus, Mauritius, and which, though referring to persons far removed from each other in period, have a connexion, not of an arbitrary kind, and bespeaking a sound tradition.

C

Both Fiech and the scribe³ of the *Armagh Codex* admit difficulties in deciphering the document, which is the parent of all attempts at Patrick's genealogy. Ferdornach

¹ *Leabhar Breac*, Fcs. p. [13], R.I.A.

² 'Four Masters' Geneal. Reg. et Sanct. Hib.,' ed. Rev. Paul Walsh, *Archiv. Hib.*, vol. v. App. 37.

³ Ferdornach, according to Dr. Reeves, and generally.

directly states so, Fiech implicitly. Both admit the name Patritius : Ferdomnach, by copying it immediately from his source, Fiech, by giving it in an Irish dress. After the mention of the name Patraicc, Fiech continues, 'Succat aainm itubrad,' thus implying that there was a second name, not found in the source whence he derived the name Patraicc. This latter source would be the *Confessio*, whereas the source for Succat would be oral, or at any rate second-hand, since he compares it with the name 'Alpuirn,' the name of Patrick's father in the *Confessio*, which he states, 'ba fissi'—that is, 'better ascertained.' This completes the names of St. Patrick directly derived from our authentic first-hand native sources.

With regard to Succat, I accept the meaning which Prof. Bury accepts for it, but I would further equate it to the Latin Palladius. The praenomen Patritius naturally was adopted in Irish usage, and retained its form, slightly adapted; the second name entered into literary tradition, and suffered from interpretation. 'Macc alpuirn, maic otide' presents no difficulties, nor does 'hoadeochain,' but that 'odissi' does not properly belong is apparent from its insertion in the *Confessio* as marginal, though by the same hand. It had, however, an influence in infecting subsequent lists of the genealogy. The line, 'Macc alpuirn maic otide hoadeochain odissi' is clearly an expansion of 'aathair,' who was Calpurnius, son of Potitus, and he, Calpurnius, was a deacon. Fiech gives the genealogy as found in the *Confessio*. It would be strange were he to give another degree in the genealogy. 'Hoadeochain' I take, then, to refer to Calpurnius, leaving 'odissi' to be explained. Finding this word marginal in the *Confessio* and in conjunction with the suspicious 'ut ipse ait' of Muirchu, and from the consideration of the relationship of son and father and grandfather in Roman custom, I feel constrained to reject it from serious consideration as a true element in the pedigree. I would suggest that 'odissi' of Fiech corresponds to the 'ut ipse ait' of Muirchu, that is to say, the certainty of his father's name comes from the *ipse dixit* of Patrick himself in the

Confessio. I know no source of greater certainty. I cannot state whether Muirchu borrowed from Fiech, or if it is a mere coincidence. As for Fiech, I expect that, turning from an oral, or perhaps from a difficult literary source infected orally,¹ Fiech states that the father's name was better ascertained, and I take the line to be translated in that sense, namely, that it refers to Calpurnius, a deacon, son of Potitus, because Patrick himself has said so, in the *Confessio*. As Muirchu states, 'Cualforni diaconi ortus, filio, ut ipse ait, Potiti presbyteri,' and as 'diaconus' was a decisive attribute of Calpurnus, it can scarcely be doubted that in writing 'filii odissi,' referable in the margin to 'presbyteri' of the text, Ferdomnach was influenced injudiciously by Fiech and Muirchu, but fortunately with sufficient doubt to make it marginal, and not to insert it in the text which would be a gross imposture, were there nothing in the text before him to justify it.

In verse 3 we have another word which, like 'odissi,' has infected the genealogy—Cothraige. Prof. Bury has accepted it, and I likewise noted it on the strength of the same authorities, but on coming more closely to examine its claim to inclusion in the genealogical list, I have been unable to substantiate it, and I feel constrained to abandon it, as an equivalent for Patraicc, however much induced thereto on purely analogous etymological grounds. Otherwise by any logical criterion, I am unable to admit Cothraige as a new name. To do so would spoil the symmetry of the poem, remarkable in other respects, in the sequence of events, thus: 'Patrick was born in Nemthur, he was sixteen years old when captured, he was called Succat . . . ; we are more sure of his father's name, Calpuirn, he was six years in bondage, he ate not human food'—(then occur the words under immediate consideration: 'batar ile Cothraige cethar trebe diafognad')—'he escapes under Victor's ægis, crossing the Alps, and joins Germanus in the South of Latium, and remains with him in the islands of the

¹ Cf. the discussion of 'bannaum taberniae, etc.,' *infra*.

Tyrrhenian Sea.' Sir Samuel Ferguson, remarking on the Hymn of Fiech, observes: 'It nowhere borrows the language of the other Lives. They add to and improve on the matter found in it. It gives one *alias* to Patrick, Succat. They add Cothraige and Magonius.'¹ Nevertheless, he subsequently renders verse 3 thus:

Six years in hard thralldom, man's victuals he ate not;
Four masters *Cothraige* obeyed in their households.

Tirechan explains Cothraige: 'quia servivit iiii. domibus magorum.' The Prologue to the *Vita* of Muirchu, from the Brussels *Codex*, gives from Tirechan the same reason, the word itself being omitted, apparently through inadvertence, but the *Vita* mentions only Sochet, thus: 'Patricius, qui et Sochet vocabatur.' The Prologue is not an independent source, while the *Vita* does not give it, so that we are left with the 'batar ile Cothraige cethar trebe diafognad' of Fiech, and 'Cothirthiacus, quia servivit iiii. domibus majorum' of Tirechan. It is apparent that the explanation given of the name is in direct opposition to the intrinsic meaning of the name Patraicc, so that we are left in the dilemma that, etymologically Cothraige = Patraicc, according to philologists, while the primary authorities attempt to interpret the meaning by a fanciful popular derivation. In the first equation Cothraige disappears as a serious element in our list. In the second the difficulty remains that two independent, or apparently independent, sources give Cothraige in association with an added meaning. If Cothraige were the popular form of the name Patritius, its meaning had become obscure, and its use obsolete by the time of Fiech and Tirechan, a time when interest was revived in the antecedents and personality of Patrick, when the Irish Church, as it were, began to be self-conscious of its origins. It being evident, then, that Cothraige, if ever employed as an equivalent of Patritius, is to be explained on etymological grounds, as the alternative would imply the invention of a popular name to meet the supposed fact

¹ *Trans.*, R.I.A., vol. xxvii., Part vi. 103-5, 'On the Patrician Documents.'

that Patrick 'served four tribes,' I am therefore compelled to seek for some other explanation of the word from Fiech alone. Marianus Scotus, Windisch, and Stokes accepted the 'four-tribes' explanation. Though I am considering the primary texts, I must nevertheless state that Tirechan seems to me to have derived the name Cothirthiacus from a misunderstood Fiech tradition. Though the present discussion is only collateral to the main argument, I shall continue it on account of the interest which attaches to the word itself. To return, then, to the line, 'batar ile Cothraige cethar trebe diafognad,' not alone would the introduction of a new proper name be a violent return to the question of the name, but the statement would be falsified by the next statement of Fiech and by the *Confessio* itself, whether we translate 'Cothraige of the four tribes was in servitude to many,' or 'Many were they, whom Cothraige of the four tribes served'; for Fiech says, 'Asbert Victor frigniad Milcon tessed fortonna,' mentioning only one known master, while St. Patrick says in the *Confessio* that, on receiving word from his friend Victor, 'intermisi hominem cum quo fueram sex annis,' implying that he had the one master during the entire known period of his captivity. This seems to me sufficient to utterly destroy the meanings which have been assigned to the word; nevertheless, as I have devoted my remarks to destructive criticism, I think it right to offer an alternative constructive attempt. I would translate the verse thus:—

He was six years in bondage, men's meats he ate not,
Varied were the kinds of them, the four tribes made use of.

In the sequence of narration the only place in the *Confessio* which offers a parallel to the 'maisse dōine' of the verse, is where Patrick refused to share food used in pagan sacrifice with his companions during his flight. There is nothing abnormal in the use of 'maisse dōine' in this sense, as equivalent to sacrificial meats. The *Vita* of Muirchu is based partly upon the *Confessio* in the opening chapters, being an epitome of the narrative, and in

referring to the incident of the sacrificial food, Muirchu says : 'abundantiam cibi ex grege porcorum a Deo misso sibi velut ex coturni cum turma Deo aiuvante prebuit.'¹ The occurrence of this word 'coturni' in this context appears to me of high import in connexion with the word Cothraige in our verse. The occurrences of the word Cothraige in Tirechan have no special reference to the point at present under consideration. Taking the sense in which I have translated it, it would derive from a stem 'cot' with a collective termination 'raige.' The word 'cuid' is common in the sense of portion, kind, etc. The *Sanas Cormaic* equates 'coth' to 'biad'; whilst the 'gens' name Crothraige is an example of the ending '-raige,' of which Prof. MacNeill has collected examples in equivalence to 'macu,' 'moccu.'² That, as Prof. Bury points out, there was an older labiovelar form, Qadriga, Qotriche, seems to me still further to negative the existence of a name for Patrick. Apart from its resemblance to the Latin *quadriga*, of which the meaning and word itself would scarcely be a subject for popular assimilation, it is known that St. Patrick's occupation was that of a herd. At any rate, in literary tradition, whatever name Patrick may have been known by to his associates during his six years of slavery, would be obliterated by the name by which he proclaimed himself in the years when, later, he became more widely known. In dealing with literary tradition, then, we are concerned with the genuine names of Patrick. In no dialect of modern Irish have I noticed any tendency to a form Cothraige for Patrick, but rather a tendency to accentuate the labial in uninfected position and to change it to labial-spirant in infected. The 'cethar trebe' I take to mean the people of Ireland generally. Eugene O'Curry³ remarks : 'To these four (viz., Eber, Erimon, Emir, Lugaidh), all the great

¹ *Vita S. Pat.*, etc., edidit R. P. Ed. Hogan, S.J. (Brussels, 1882, Polleunis, etc.), p. 23, l. 3 and note.

² *Eriu*, vol. iii.

³ *MSS. Materials*, p. 207.

lines of the Milesian family . . . are traced up.' The poem of Fiech has the following references in verses 18, 19, 20 :—

18. Patraic pridchais do *scotaib*. . . .

19. Meice *emir* meice *erimon*. . . .

20. Pridchais . . . croich crisd do thuathaib *jene*.¹

I conclude, therefore, that the Cothraige element is falsely derived from Fiech, and fancifully from the Prologue to Muirchu and from Tirechan, and that in translating the verse we must adapt the word to the context, and not *vice versa*. From the consideration, therefore, of Fiech and the *Confessio*, two names only emerge, viz., Patritius and Succat. We may, then, make our first statements thus :—

1. St. Patrick calls himself Patritius in the *Confessio*.
2. Fiech unequivocally styles him Patraicc.
3. Fiech attributes to him an additional name, Succat
4. The Prologue to Muirchu gives four names :

Sochet, quando natus est,

Contice, quando servivit.

Mavonius, quando legit

Patritius, quando ordinatus est.

5. Muirchu gives only Patritius and Sochet.
6. Tirechan gives :

Magonus, qui est clarus,

Succetus, qui est Patritius,

Cothirthiacus, quia servivit iiii domibus magorum.

Victor, in verse 4, has a definite function, whilst that of Germanus is equally obvious.

THE NAME OF PATRICK

With regard to the name of St. Patrick, it may be thus deduced :—

(1) The 'Confessio' in the *Book of Armagh* supplies : Patritius Calpurnii filius, filii Potiti. (2) Fiech gives Patritius and Succat. (3) Muirchu : Patritius and Sochet. (4) Prologue to *Vita* of Muirchu : Sochet, Contice, Mavonius, Patritius. (5) Tirechan : Magonus, Succetus (qui est Patritius),

¹ Ibid. Zimmer.

and Cothirthiacus. (6) The *Leabhar Breac* gives the elements Patritius, Succat, Cothraige in one sequence, and Patritius (Calpurnius), Cornelius in a second. (7) The Four Masters give Patritius (*f. Calpurnii f. Potiti f. Odissi f.*), Corniuil, etc. Eliminating Potitus as superfluous and Odissi as false, I retain the elements Patritius (Calpurnius), Cornelius. There is no mention by the Four Masters of either Cothraige or Succat.

Prof. Bury suggests as the complete name 'Patricius Magonus Sucatus.' With this simplified form I agree, but I replace the element Magonus by Cornelius, first, because Magonus is found only in Tirechan, and as Imigonus in the Prologue to Muirchu equated to Clarus; secondly, the *Leabhar Breac* gives the Succat sequence without Magonus, but gives Cornelius in the genealogy proper. I think this is absolutely conclusive, and entitles me to go a step further in giving the true name as 'Patritius Cornelius Palladius';¹ a name which is distinguished in the associations of all its parts and containing nothing offensively Gothic.

It remains for me, at this point, to associate this name with the Roman birth and origin of Patrick, and to point out how the venerable legends may be associated with it. I have been led more recently, since expressing the opinion that the birth-place of St. Patrick was to be sought for 'at, or in the vicinity of Rome,' to actually locate it within the city itself, principally from the conviction that St. Patrick was referring to a locality thoroughly familiar to those to whom his *Confessio* was addressed, to his compeers and contemporaries, and certainly not some obscure outpost on the outskirts of the Empire.

In the year 306 A.D. the baths of Diocletian were built. In that year also took place the martyrdom of St. Agnes. In my previous article I suggested that the 'Potitus, serbus

¹ The name Succat is generally equated to Palladius, and here I may also observe that, apart from the reasons given by Petrie, I cannot but recognize in the instigator of the anti-Pelagian mission of Germanus, the first apostle of the Scots, Patrick.

Dei,' who adorned her shrine, was the Potitus of the *Confessio*. The date for this event I would expect to be about the year 383 A.D., when a new life was coming into the Christian community through the edict of Milan. The Vicus Patritius, running between the Viminal and Esquiline, towards the church of Pudentiana, would suggest the name of Patrick, and furthermore connect him with the Cornelii. The Vicus Bannauem would answer the description of a street or district, descending from the baths of Diocletian towards the Viminal, and the villa of Potitus would be situated near the Decem Tabernae and also the titular church of St. Vitale, in the diaconia of St. Agatha.

Muirchu, in the *Life of St. Patrick*, when, after a considerable lapse of time, interest was aroused in the mission and origins of St. Patrick, after the words 'Potiti presbyteri' introduces the phrase, 'qui fuit vico Ban navem thabur,' and continues, 'indecha, ut procul a mari nostro, quem vicum constanter indubitanterque comperimus esse ventre.' Dr. Gwynn gives the reading 'bannauem taberniae' from the *Confessio*, so we need not be surprised that Muirchu, having read 'navem,' enlarges on it thus: 'ut procul a mari nostro,' which therefore we may eliminate, and further suspect his exaggerated identification of 'ventre,' 'prius ventre.' Probus gives 'Bannave Tiburniae regionis' for the 'Ban navem thabur indecha' and 'Neustriae' for 'Ventre,' from which I conclude that what Muirchu found was what we may infer from Muirchu, Probus, and Dr. Gwynn, viz., the 'Vicus bannauem Taberniae' of the sentence, 'Potiti presbyteri qui fuit uico bannauem Taberniae uillulam enim prope habuit' was a 'Vicus Balnearum' near the 'Tabernae X' (indecha) 'regionis tertiae' of Rome, and that there Patrick was born, or living, at the time of his capture, in his sixteenth year, in the year 410 A.D. Furthermore, having seen how Muirchu and Probus dealt with the phrase 'Bannauem Taberniae' may it not be lawful to suspect that where Muirchu read 'ban navem thabur indecha,' and Probus 'Bannave Tiburniae regionis Neustriae,' Fiech found n-em th-ur for purposes of

metre, and gave us his opening line, 'Genair Patraice i nemthur,' which has sent so many enthusiasts astray in search of the homeland of Patrick.

* * * *

Mr. Anscombe, in treating of a link in the pedigree of Patrick,¹ connects the final elements with Jutish sources. The source and the reason may, I think, be fairly admitted. The reason would be to introduce the legend of Patrick's birth in Britain. The source would be from Bede.² Mr. Anscombe connects this legend with the legend of the *Vita Quarta* regarding a Jewish strain in Patrick.

I shall attempt to show the construction of the various groups of elements of the later genealogies.

I. *Roman*.—(1) Patritius, Calpurni, Fodaige, from the *Confessio*. (2) 'Odius,' marginal 'odissi,' in *Codex Ardm*. Similarly in Fiech. (3) Coirniuil. I have already treated of the elements in (1), (2), and (3). (4) Liberiud. (5) Mercuit, Oda, Oricc, Muricc, Oircc. (6) Leo, Maximus.

II. *Jutish*.—I accept Mr. Anscombe's suggestion for the elements following, down to Briotain.

III. *Irish*.—At Fergasa leithdeire the pedigree is switched on to the Milesian line, in the usual orthodox fashion, and thence to the

IV. *Biblical*, to connect with Adam.

Returning to the Roman group. I have already dealt in detail with (1), (2), and (3), showing how they indicate the Roman associations of Patrick, from a consideration of our two fundamental texts and the subsidiary texts of Muirchu and Tirechan. It is satisfying to find it stated that Patrick, like other Romans, had four names.³ Modern writers seem to have allowed this statement to pass unchallenged. I would offer the following criticism. On the

¹ *Ériu*, vol. vi. part i.

² From Nothelm through Bede, the A.S. Chronicle, Alfred, thence through Flann of Monasterboice (ob. c. 1056) into later Irish work (?).

³ 'Patritius sicut ceteri Romani,' appears like a play upon the names Patritius, Succat, Cothirthiacus, *romagnus—an attempt at a full epigraphic form of the name (?). Cf. 'Multa Patricius habuit nomina ad Similitudinem Romanorum nobilium.' (Scholion on Fiech.)

supposition that Patritius = Cothraige, the Prologue of Muirchu supplies but three real names. So, too, Tirechan. Muirchu, in the *Vita* proper, supplies but two. In admitting four names the problem asks solution. Fiech gives likewise but two, Patraice and Succat. The Prologue gives four, but in equating Patritius to Cothraige, three. Tradition gives Succat equating to Palladius, philology, Cothraigee quating to Patritius, so that there remain, as I have said, three elements, Patritius, Palladius, and Magonus. Magonus=Clarus, according to the Prologue, and equates to Cornelius, by inspection of the *Leabar Breac* and Four Masters' pedigrees, so that the three elements may be stated as Patritius, Cornelius, Palladius. The fourth remains obscure. I venture to suggest Calpurnius in a full epigraphic form, thus, 'Patritius Calpurnii f. Cornelius Palladius,' or simply 'Patritius Cornelius Palladius.'

By connecting Patrick with the Corneliï we thus incorporate the Roman Jewish legend, bringing him into contact with the history of Cornelius Pudens, Pudentiana and Praxedes, Aquila and Prisca, Agnes and Caecilia, Acilio Glabrio and the Flavii. Though Liberius in the pedigree remains obscure to me as regards a personal relationship to Patrick, it nevertheless is not without significance that Liberius was Roman-born and erected the famous basilica, 'Ad Nives,' in the heart of the Jewish quarter and in the midst of those places which, as I have tried to prove, are associated with the history of Patrick. The whole tenor of the *Confessio* and the Epistle to Coroticus seem to me to designate the personality of one conscious of his status among a class proudly conservative of their dignity, almost to such a degree as to refuse to send the Cross where the Roman Eagle was not planted. Likewise he deemed it necessary to assert his nobility to secure his recognition by the not less proud Irish kings and chieftains. I think this factor played a large part in the success of his mission, and for the same reason Martin was successful in Gaul. That he was wealthy the *Confessio* makes clear. Victor apparently

showed an unusual solicitude in his regard, he was protected peculiarly by Germanus, and his fellow-captives in Ireland demanded his return to them. I expect that Germanus secured for him his father's and grandfather's possessions as well as sponsoring his ecclesiastical career. And if we find Palladius described by Prosper as deacon, we might infer that he had charge of the diaconia of St. Agatha. Potitus, who decorated the altar of St. Agnes, would belong thereto also, for the title of St. Vitale has been shown to be connected with the cemetery of the Via Nomentana. That St. Patrick was ordained in and sent from the Catacombs by Celestine may be picturesque, but the legend of the *Lives*, that his ordination took place in the presence of Theodosius, is more conformable to the epoch of freedom in which I believe the event took place. However, my present purpose is to point out the coincidence of the Irish legend of St. Patrick, with the Roman legend of Cornelius Pudens, which serves to explain at once the reference to a Jewish strain in Patrick and the source of the influence and power of Patrick in Rome. With regard to the Lateran legend I cannot venture to investigate it rigidly. It has not a place in the sources which so far I have been studying. But I would venture to point out that it occupies a collateral position, in so far as regards its proximity to the places I would identify as of personal interest with regard to Patrick. Also there is the association of Constantia with Agnes, and Constantine's birth in Britain. But, as I have said, I have no evidence of a direct personal connexion from our sources.

The same difficulties that we meet with in regard to the origin and private history of Patrick face us in the case of St. Martin, whose personality was otherwise so well established. In both cases what seemed obvious was not chronicled and became lost in the period of great change and transition then taking place. Likewise the object and method of biography were peculiar to the time. St. Patrick indeed has left us a personal memoir, the details of which, however unfortunately scant, became for us, more

unfortunately still, obscure and illegible in the manuscript from which our copies derive. St. Martin left as indelible a Roman stamp upon Gaul as Patrick left on Ireland, both being Romans *du pur sang*. As St. Patrick, on his escape from Ireland, proceeded, according to Fiech, to 'an island in the Tyrrhenian Sea, off the south coast of Latium,' so the *Life of St. Martin*¹ brings St. Martin to an island in the same sea called Gallinaria. Identifying this with the modern group, Li Galli, as I endeavoured to identify the island retreat of Patrick with Ischia, their proximity is apparent, and I think it no fortuitous circumstance that has connected Patrick and Martin and Germanus but a true bond of kindred and fellow-citizenship. Germanus, Martin, Maurice, Patrick, and Calpurnius all belonged to the military caste. St. Martin was born at Sabaria, in Pannonia. Padua and Gallinaria are places of interest in his career. The tradition of the Val Rosea is that which peculiarly interests us in the Patrician Lives, but it seems to have baffled research. On the presumption that Martin, too, was Roman,² and on the widely diffused tradition of his connexion with the mother of St. Patrick, I endeavoured to find a reference to such a place at, or in the vicinity of, Rome. So far I have found only one such place, referred to by Cicero as near the River Nar, north of Rome. Again, we are told St. Martin dedicated his first church at Tours in honour of St. Maurice. Returning to (5) of the Roman group of elements of the pedigree, I offer the name of Mauritius as the solution of the single name of which Muricc, Oircc, Oricc, Oda, Mercuit, I take to be the *dissecta membra*. Flann³ gives Ota, Orric, Moiricc. Evidently we have in them the corrupt forms of a single word, which from its position in the pedigree should equate to an original Latin form. Again, I have pointed out the existence of the name Cornelius in the pedigree, and I take it to be pivotal in the structure of the pedigree,

¹ 'Vita Martini,' Sulpicius Severus, *Codex Ardm.*, p. [382].

² The site of the ancient title of S. Martino ai Monti seems to point to a local connexion.

³ Flann of Monasterboice, c. 1056.

artificial in its groups and in its parts. It denominates an illustrious Roman gens. In the final (6) group we have Leo and Maximus. These two I take as one. Among the acts of Leo recorded in the Roman Breviary is: 'Ipse via Appia sub nomine Sancti Cornelii alteram (ecclesiam) condidit' (Suppl. Hib., April 11), and in the lessons of St. Cornelius, Pope and Martyr, we find: 'Lucina humavit (Cornelium) in arenaria praedii sui prope coemiteriam Callisti' (Sept. 16).

On any grounds, the intercourse between the great Pontiff and St. Patrick may be presumed as natural and intimate. On the theory of the dates which I ascribed to St. Patrick, their activities were contemporaneous. Leo was presumably a Roman, and as deacon rendered signal service to the Church, being recalled by the strong wish of the Romans to succeed Sixtus. It seems very strange that no mention of him occurs in the *Confessio*, but again I would venture to suggest that the evidence has been maltreated in the successive transcriptions of the documents. I have referred in the previous article to the manner in which sanctioned phrases and terms were misunderstood by those who had apparently no direct intimate acquaintance with the objects to which they referred, and for this reason I think divine and supernatural agencies replaced in our copies intelligible natural agencies. For that reason I read into St. Patrick's defence that he had a stronger friend to support him than Germanus, who, at a critical juncture, opposed him, and that this friend was the Roman Pontiff Leo, whose friendship was grounded on kinship, cemented by their occupying the same office of influence and administration in the diaconates of the city. I would like to draw attention to the existence of a peculiar cult, referred to by Father Neary,¹ for which he says he cannot find any adequate local reason. He states that the Feast of St. Leo is locally observed as a public holiday in the ordinary way. If it is not a case of substitution it is of an interest not merely general. I cannot do more than note it.

¹ Article on 'Inishark and Inishboffin,' I. E. RECORD, March, 1920.

The last name with which I have to deal is that of Conchessa, in tradition mother of St. Patrick and sister or relative of Martin. I am here concerned with the name in its Roman associations. I equate Conchessa to the Latin Pudentia. I frankly confess the evidence is slight, though I hope it may be accepted as sufficient, where the material is so scant and obscure, and where any help that is corroborative is welcome. The *Annals of the Four Masters* give, sub anno 432, the reference, 'Cochmas a matair malla,' from Flann, and John O'Donovan translates it 'Cochnias, his *modest* mother.' That Cochnias appears in this translation is evidence of the mutations to which the transcription of the various names was liable. As regards 'malla,' I do not believe John O'Donovan's mind was influenced by any idea of its possible equation to a Latin name, Pudentia. Nor would I have been led to do so were it not that I had been dealing with the Cornelian legend. As the name does not occur in Fiech or the *Confessio* I do not intend to examine it further in this place.

Having completed the examination into the personal names, my next object was to locate the cemeteries wherein might be found occurrences of the names. The association of Cornelius, Pudentia, and the legend of the Jewish strain in Patrick led me to examine the monuments of, first, the cemetery of Callixtus and the area of the Suburra, Viminal and Esquiline, and, finally, the cemeteries of Agnes on the Via Nomentana, and Priscilla on the Salaria Nova. It was in this latter, 'perhaps the greatest and most important of the catacombs of Rome,'¹ that I found occurrences of the names sought for, except Potitus, which, as I have pointed out, occurs at Agnes, though not as a sepulchral inscription. Tradition asserts the relationship between Prisca and Aquilla and the family of Cornelius Pudens, so that in examining the inscriptions of this catacomb we

¹ Prof. Orazio Marucchi, to whom I am indebted largely for much of the information in the latter portion of this article. Similarly, in the Irish arguments, I acknowledge the help supplied by the editing of the Brussels MSS. by Father Hogan, S.J.

are still adhering to the tradition which led us to the Viminal. We must bear in mind also the association of the Pudentes with the Cornelii Emillii and the Caecilii. The explorations of 1887 led to the discovery of the tomb of the Acilii Glabriones. It was J. B. de Rossi who indicated the possible connexion between Prisca of the Acts of the Apostles and Priscilla, the mother of Pudens, through the discovery of the inscription of Caius Pudens Cornelianus near the titular church of Prisca. The names that occur are C.Ae. Victor Flavianus, Celestinus (Pope), Palladius (in Greek characters), Cornelia, Calpurnia, Calpurniani, [Modestina], [Verecundus], [Vitalis], Acilius Glabrio.

* * * *

I have given an account of the reasons which, within the limits of this article, have persuaded me of the Roman origins and connexions of St. Patrick and, on this great background, to throw his personality into relief. He is no mere product of hero-growth, or subject for sciolist analysis, but a man of flesh and blood, who accomplished a great work, not seen in its full perspective by his contemporaries, animated by generous and kindly instincts, and endowed with gifts of mind and heart of the highest order. The fact that the details of his life are obscured takes nothing from the strength of his character, and, in endeavouring to ascertain them, I have, as far as possible, dealt leniently with ancient landmarks while accentuating the primary characteristics on which his claim is set in Irish Christianity: he is no mere eponym, Patrick is not a legend but a name, the name of one who, having attached himself to our race, might say with still greater reason than St. Paul: *Civis Romanus sum*.

MICHAEL T. MACSWEENEY.

THE CHURCH IN FRANCE AFTER FIFTEEN YEARS OF SEPARATION

BY STEPHEN J. BROWN, S.J.

THE first twenty years of the twentieth century have been marked by two events which have profoundly modified the position of the Church in France—the Separation and the War. The effects of the one have been at work for some fifteen years, those of the other for seven. A sufficient space of time interval has thus elapsed for a review of these effects to be instructive. And it cannot be without interest for us in Ireland to revise our views of Catholic France at a moment when, for the first time, it has become possible for us to enter freely into relations with our neighbour nations. My task in attempting a brief review of the position of the Church in France resulting from the Separation and the War has been rendered easy by the appearance in September last of remarkable articles contributed to the *Revue des deux Mondes* by the able and well-known writer, the Vicomte Georges d'Avenel, whose book, *Les Français de mon Temps*, has become a classic.¹ To which may be added the present writer's experience, during five years' residence among French people.

How fares it, then, with the Church in France after fifteen years of Separation? It was, as we know, in 1906 that the French Chambers passed a law whereby the Church was disestablished. Not merely did the State cease to support the clergy, it simply confiscated the property of the Church to the value of some twenty-four millions sterling (600,000,000 francs). In using the term 'disestablished'

¹ This book (to be had in the Nelson series of French classics) contains a chapter, 'Ce qu'il reste de christianisme en France,' which deserves to be read and pondered by every student of French Catholicism.

I do not mean to convey that before Separation the Church held anything resembling the privileged position of the Church of Ireland before 1869, or of the Church of England to-day, considered as important departments of State, respected—at least officially—liberally provided for. On the contrary, for some twenty years previous to the Separation the State had almost unceasingly harried the Church, had striven, with poor success it is true, to get its creatures into the episcopal sees, had in 1900 and subsequent years driven the religious Orders out of France, and confiscated all it could seize of their belongings, and had cut off one subvention after another. In compensation for which attentions the State paid the parish priests of France the princely salary of £36 a year (900 fr.) and tied up their ministry with a variety of restrictions. The law of 1906 suppressed the *Budget des Cultes* and consequently all salaries. The seminaries, the episcopal palaces, even the presbyteries, were seized as State property and the Church was turned adrift to shift for herself.¹

The men who wrought the Separation looked upon it as a death-blow to the Church in France. Where was she to find resources for the support of her 40,000 clergy? How would she henceforth provide for the education of the thousands of candidates who had filled her seminaries? And then, what family would be so foolish as to allow its sons to enter on a career henceforth so hopeless in its prospects? They reckoned without the people of France.

How have the clergy of France endured the ordeal? We have abundant material for an answer. To take first the recruiting of the clergy. For a time, about four or five years perhaps, there was a serious falling off in the number of vocations.² The prospect seemed too hopeless.

¹ I cannot here enter into the question whether the Republic, or rather the particular group of politicians who held the power, had any legitimate grievances against the French clergy on the score of political opposition. The fact of such grievances could not, in any event, lessen materially the enormity of this spoliation.

² In 1910 there were 6,530 seminarians—half the numbers for 1905.

The impression was pretty widespread that to become a candidate for Holy Orders was to face hopeless poverty, to be forced, as people said, to beg one's bread. The consequence of this falling off was felt just before the War, when the number of ordinations became insufficient for the needs of the Church. It was, of course, still more insufficient during the years of the War, for all the younger clergy were at the Front. But towards 1909 the scare had already begun to pass away. The *petits séminaires*, the main source of vocations to the priesthood, began to fill up once more, and were never better filled than in the years 1913-1917. Some of these seminaries actually doubled their numbers within a period of three years. Nearly everywhere normal figures were regained.

Immediately upon the passing of the law of Separation—and spoliation—the *denier du culte* was everywhere organized for the support of the clergy and the maintenance of all the functions of the Church. The amount so raised varied, of course, from diocese to diocese. In small dioceses, such as Gap or Digne, it came to only about £4,000 a year. In others, such as Arras or Saint-Brieux, it amounted to over £24,000 (700,000 fr.). The average before the War was about £12,000, and it was steadily rising. At La Rochelle, for instance, it rose from 160,000 fr. in 1906 to 232,000 in 1913. Even so, the salary which the Bishops could afford to allot to their priests was, in many places, very meagre: only £20 in the diocese of Mende,¹ nowhere more than £40 a year. Yet the experience of the past fifteen years has made it apparent that the Church of France will henceforth be able to support her clergy as she has proved herself able to maintain their numbers. The present depletion in the ranks of the clergy, so much deplored by M. Georges Goyau last May, at the *Semaine des Ecrivains Catholiques*, is mainly due to the numbers killed

¹ It is told that the Bishop of Dax called together his clergy to announce to them that he could give them only 300 fr. (£12) a year. Not a murmur of complaint was heard. They would have starved had not their parishioners made them presents in kind, and richer dioceses sent them alms.

in the War, and the poverty among them is another consequence of the War. In that terrible catastrophe more than three thousand of the French clergy fell. However numerous the recruits that have joined the Church's standards since, it will be long, and very long, before these cruel losses are made good. Early in the present year a French Jesuit, Père Donœur, depicted in the most sombre colours the situation created by the War.¹

One might be tempted to suppose that the pressing demands of the *dernier du culte* would have sucked dry the sources upon which previously existing works of piety, charity, and education had been drawing. But no: they are no less prosperous now than under the Concordat. Not one has been suppressed for lack of funds, and many new works have come into being. There are dioceses in which the three main collections, viz., the Propagation of the Faith, the *Sainte Enfance*, and Peter's Pence realize 100,000 fr. a year; there are others in which clerical incomes have been reduced by half and in which, nevertheless, up to four hundred Catholic schools are maintained, without a penny from the public funds. Nearly everywhere, it may be said, these schools absorb a good half of the diocesan revenue. *L'œuvre des vocations* has contributed greatly towards this result. For instance, in the diocese of Versailles, where vocations were at a very low ebb, this 'work' collected 27,000 fr. in 1913; 32,000 in 1915; 50,000 in 1917; 114,000 in 1919. It has now 200 in the *petit séminaire* and 86 in the *grand séminaire*.

The *denier du culte* is not the only way in which the faithful contribute to the support of the Church. There is what is called the *casuel* (fees or perquisites), a traditional contribution (often made in kind) to the incomes of the parochial clergy on the occasion of certain services or on certain Church festivals, such as the Rogations. Then in certain places the urban or rural councils make small grants to the clergy, screening themselves from the consequences

¹ *Études*, 1921, p. 14: 'La Reconstruction spirituelle du pays.'

of such illegal action, by various devices. Finally, there are the Mass stipends, which were only 1 fr. 50 or 2 fr. before the War and are now from 4 fr. to 5 fr. Yet, with the present cost of living, these resources taken together amount, as the Vicomte d'Avenel says, in many cases merely to a famine pittance. 'They therefore live poorly,' he adds, 'but they live free, zealous in their apostolate, *et cette misère volontaire leur donne une assez fière auréole parmi notre nation qui goûte peu le pain sec.*'

Yet in spite of these meagre resources the number of the parochial clergy has in many places been increased, parishes have been divided, and new churches built. The archdiocese of Paris is a wonderful example of what has been done. Since the Separation there have been built in that archdiocese alone no less than 54 new churches. As there existed in 1905 222 churches and public chapels, 172 of which were parochial, these 54 new churches represent an increase of twenty-five per cent. over the Separation figure.¹

Of these churches by far the greater number have been built in the outlying suburbs of Paris, and sorely were they needed. Instead of the pretty little villages of former days these suburbs are now huge and heterogeneous masses of population, industrial towns of from 40,000 to 80,000 inhabitants. Here the sorry remnants of one-time rural villages are mingled with hideous new many-storied structures, alternating with improvised huts, waste lands, and rubbish heaps. Here a *déraciné* rural population from the provinces is mingled with adventurers from every foreign country, and with nondescripts from all parts of France. Of course, besides these, there are also highly respectable rural suburbs, but these latter do not concern us for the moment.

This new and variegated population was living before

¹ Mention of church building recalls to our mind the awful havoc wrought by the War amid the churches of Northern France. An appeal just issued by the French Bishops states that the number of churches still to be restored in this year, 1922, is little short of 3,000.

the Separation in an appalling state of spiritual destitution. The State control of Church finance rendered the creation of new parishes and the erection of new churches almost impossible. After the Separation the Church undertook the evangelization of these people, as she might undertake that of South Sea islanders. A few concrete instances will show the nature of the task she undertook better than any generalities could do.

The story of Ivry-Port is typical. To this ugly and poverty-stricken township of some 15,000 inhabitants an earnest young priest was sent in 1908. Scarcely had he taken up his residence in a little two-roomed house when a messenger arrived from the mayor to inform him that they wanted neither priest nor God in Ivry-Port. Nothing daunted, when Sunday came, the priest put up an altar in a neighbouring shed, and rang a bell. A woman arrives, hesitating, then a child, then another; five or six all told. He says his Mass and speaks a few words to the 'congregation,' telling them the purpose of his coming and asking them to tell their neighbours. If we were to come back a year later we should have found another shed added to the first, and the two together much too small, all the elements of Catholic organization in being, if only in embryo. In the streets where he was at first greeted with hoots and jeers he passes amid respectful silence.

At Petit Ivry a little chapel, capable of holding 500, was opened in 1911. It was poor accommodation in a township of 12,000 inhabitants, but it was more than enough for the eight or ten persons who, up to then, had been taking the trouble to go two miles to hear Mass. At first the children were positively frightened at sight of a *soutane*, but they soon began to find out that the new *curé* was after all 'a good sort,' and in four months there were 236 children in the *patronage*. To attract the men the *curé* began with lantern lectures on more or less sacred subjects. But it was uphill work. Out of 130 people at Mass on Sundays 123 were women. That was in 1912. But in 1920, when Mgr. Roland-Gosselin came

to visit the parish, not only was the chapel crammed with men, but the municipal councillors presented themselves to welcome the Bishop.

When the Abbé Fontaine arrived at Clichy nobody went to Mass on Sundays. To-day the enlarged church is seldom empty. When a special Mass was started for men seven put in an appearance. Next Sunday there was only one : he told the curé not to bother in future. To-day there is a fine Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament. Still more striking is the case of Girodet. Thirty years ago it was a slum of the worst description in which only one family took the trouble to go to the parish church, which was a considerable distance away. Here a Catholic schoolmistress of sixty opened a school in a small shop. She began with six pupils, but the number increased, and soon a room was made into a chapel. Then the Abbé Solange-Bodin was sent to found a mission. Gradually the parents were reached, through the children. To-day that school counts 600 girls, with twelve mistresses. There are 1,500 children in the *patronages*. Professional schools, boys' and men's clubs, Catholic organizations of all kinds, were already in full activity by 1911. The whole spirit of the quarter has changed. It has ceased to be hostile to religion. 'The transformation of the people,' writes M. d'Avenel, 'in their outward bearing, mentality, and morals is astonishing.'

Many other striking examples given by the same writer must be passed over for want of space. Let me merely quote his conclusion : 'Wherever the priest has gone to the people and settling amid a working population has dared to light that inexhaustible fire of love which the word of Christ arouses and spreads, everywhere he has, after a period of trial, seen the harvest spring up out of the barren soil which his apostolate has rendered fertile.' The people are ignorant and prejudiced, not hopelessly bad. In a very great proportion of those who have ceased to practise their religion belief in it still lingers. They need but to come in contact with good influences for their faith to revive.

But therein precisely lay the difficulty. How was the

contact to be established? Good will on the part of the priest was not enough to break down the barriers set up by 'lay' education, anti-Christian propaganda, Socialism, and the rest. Something had been done before the War to weaken that barrier; the great War itself has combined with the Separation laws to break it down. It is one of the ironies of Providence, one of God's revenges. Let me quote the Vicomte d'Avenel:

The laicization of primary education had greatly helped in developing the zeal of the priest; his personal action became more pronounced, but it was still exercised within a restricted sphere. Now the various measures taken by the State have powerfully aided the clergy to go outside the circle of the faithful; military service imposed on seminarists has not only freed them from their shyness but has resulted in introducing apostles into the barracks, apostles in undress uniforms, far more numerous, in far closer contact with their fellows, than the former chaplains in soutane.

No one would hail the compulsory military service of seminarists as an unmixed good: it is an evil out of which good has come. Out of the more terrible evil of the War a further good has come. It is a commonplace to-day that the *curé sac-au-dos* has won for himself in the affections of his comrades, and of the people at large, a place that he will not easily lose. An unwilling witness of their heroism one day blurted out—it is scarcely translatable—*Ces cochons-là ! ils font exprès de se faire tuer !* An anti-clerical Government willy-nilly showered upon the soldier-clergy every kind of military distinction.¹ The price, no doubt, was a terrible one. From the diocese of Paris alone 110 ecclesiastics fell at the Front. Was the price too high? That is God's secret.

Regarding the religious consequences of the War two further points may here be noted. In the first place it has produced among the men who fought in it a very large number of vocations, both to the secular and to the regular clergy. Of the eighty students who entered Issy, the

¹ See *The Soldier-Priests of France*, by the Comtesse de Courson (*Irish Messenger Office*); *Priests in the Firing Line*, by René Gaëll, etc., etc.

grand séminaire of Paris, in October, 1920, fifty-five were young officers of the great War. The novitiates of the religious Orders are better filled than before the War, and here, too, many of the new soldiers of Christ are one-time officers of a very different army. In fact, this movement towards the priestly life among men who had adopted some secular career and were no longer youths is an extraordinary feature of the after-the-War period. To quote from the article by Père Donceur already referred to :—

More and more the seminaries are filled with grown men who have left various careers to become schoolboys once more and relearn their Latin. Officers, naval and military, university professors, barristers, engineers are taking up again the glorious traditions of the Olivaints, the Gratrys, and the Ravignans. Farmers, teachers in the State schools, business men, are throwing up lucrative positions and careers to take on the heavy burdens of to-day and the almost inevitable poverty of to-morrow. It is the sufferings of the War that have revealed Christ to them.

Again, the War forced all Frenchmen who cared for France into a common brotherhood, a sinking of differences and burying of hatchets, which has come to be called the *Union Sacrée*. Once more Bishop and Mayor and General could appear on the same platforms, figure in company on great days of patriotic celebration,¹ meet each other in the friendly intercourse of social life. France's greatest soldiers were Catholics, almost with ostentation, and are proud to be seen in company with priests and prelates. Members of the Government, on occasion, went to Mass. They might not believe, but it was part of the function. The effect upon general public opinion must be considerable and the renewal of diplomatic relations with the Vatican has deepened that effect.

Curiously enough, the Separation has contributed its share, too, towards bringing the curé into closer contact with the people. It forced him, in plain terms, to go out of his presbytery to look for his living. And because the

¹ The Joan of Arc celebrations are a noteworthy example. The feast of St. Jeanne d'Arc has been made a public holiday on the same footing as the 15th of July.

average French priest, pious, educated, devoted, as he is, improved on acquaintance, the result has been all to the good.

In what has been said of the French clergy much has been said, by implication, of the laity from which they spring. An apathetic and lukewarm laity can scarcely produce a numerous and zealous clergy. On the other hand, the existence of a large body of population outside the influence of the Church has been sufficiently indicated. But to confine our review to such indirect indications would be to do the French laity less than justice. It may be possible on a future occasion to deal with that other, and no less important, aspect of French Catholicism.

STEPHEN J. BROWN, S.J.

MALACHY'S PROPHECY OF THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE

BY REV. E. F. SUTCLIFFE, S.J.

THAT the Prophet Malachy wrote about the year 450 B.C. is indicated by the striking similarity between the problems with which he deals and those that occupied Nehemiah.¹ The chief among these are the decadence of the Temple worship, mixed marriages between Jews and pagans, and irregularity in the payment of tithes. It is with the first of these that Malachy opens his short book. Almighty God is represented by the prophet as rebuking the people, and, in particular, the priests, for not requiting His love, and for neglecting His worship: 'To you, O priests, that despise My name and have said: Wherein have we despised Thy Name? You offer polluted bread upon My altar, and you say: Wherein have we polluted Thee? In that you say: The temple of the Lord is contemptible. If you offer the blind for sacrifice, is it not evil? and if you offer the lame and the sick, is it not evil?' (i. 7, 8). Then follows an injunction to turn to God with supplication that He may regard them with favour once more. 'And now beseech ye the face of God, that He may have mercy on you (for by your hand hath this been done); if by any means He will receive your faces, saith the Lord of hosts' (i. 9). Then follows the repudiation of the priests and their sacrifices. The Hebrew text reads literally: 'Also who among you and he will close the doors and will not light [the fire upon] My altar to no purpose.' That is to say: 'Oh, that one among you would close the doors, and that you would not light [the fire upon] My altar in vain!' For it was in vain that these careless

and unworthy priests offered their polluted sacrifices upon the altar. Almighty God would not accept them at their hands, and therefore He continues : ' I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts : and I will not receive a gift (*minhah*) of your hand.' Thus Almighty God, by the mouth of His prophet, formally repudiates the sacrifices offered by the Aaronic priesthood at Jerusalem. They were unworthy gifts, offered by a self-seeking priesthood ; therefore Almighty God rejects them. And this rejection of the Aaronic sacrifices does not signify the end of sacrifice to the true God ' for from the rising of the sunne euen to the going downe, great is my name among the Gentils, and in euerie place there is sacrificing, and there is offered to my name a cleane oblation : because my name is great among the Gentils, sayth the Lord of hosts.' So runs this passage in the English Doway version of 1609 ; it is a faithful translation of the Latin Vulgate. The Revised Version of 1881 translates, ' For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my name is great among the Gentiles ; and in every place incense is offered unto my name, and a pure offering : for my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Hosts.' The Revised Version also gives the marginal reading, ' for my name shall be great among the Gentiles.'

It will be seen at once that these translations give substantially the same sense, yet the variation is of sufficient importance to demand some inquiry into the state of the text. The Revised Version agrees almost exactly with the Septuagint, in which *δεδόξασται* represents ' is great,' and the word used in place of ' offering ' is *θυσία*, which denotes rather ' sacrifice.' Turning to the Hebrew text, we find that the Massorete reading is : ' and in every place *muqtar muggash* to My Name, and a pure *minhah*.' Some few remarks must be made on the three words which are here transliterated from the Hebrew. *Muqtar* and *muggash* are both passive participles of the *hophal*, i.e., participles of the causative passive, neither of which occurs in any other place in the Bible. The former is derived from a form

qatar, unused in the *Qal*, or simple form. Its meaning in the *piel*, or intensive active, is to make sacrifices smoke, to offer them by burning, and it is used sometimes of offering incense ; similarly, in the *hiphil*, or causative active, it signifies to make sacrifices smoke, to cause incense to smoke, to offer incense ; and in the *hophal*, the causative passive, its meaning is to be made to smoke, that is, as a sacrifice. From this root are derived words signifying *incense*, *altar of incense*, and *censer* or *thurible*.¹ Taken by itself, this participle may be used as a finite verb, signifying that smoke is made to arise, whether the smoke of incense or of sacrifice ; or it may be used as a noun signifying ' incense.' It was in this latter sense, though possibly not with the Massoretic vocalization, that the word was understood by the Septuagint translators.

The word *muggash*, also, as has been said, a passive participle of the *hophal*, is from the verb *nagash*. This word signifies in its different voices, to draw or come near, to cause to approach or to bring. And as to bring to the altar is to offer, the word took on this latter sense ; so Malachy i. 7, ii. 12, iii. 3. Thus in the *hophal* its meaning is to be brought near or to be offered.

Coming now to the third word *minhah*, and following the same lexicon, we find that it bears the following meanings according to the context. All, as will be seen, are closely allied. It signifies a *gift*, or *present*, *tribute*, an *offering* made to God, of any kind, whether grain or animals, and specifically a *grain offering* ' whether raw, roasted, ground to flour, or prepared as bread or cakes.' For the present we may accept the meaning *offering*, without inquiring whether the context favours this generic sense or the specific meaning of *grain offering*.

After these explanations, it is clear that the Hebrew text indicated above may signify

- (1) In every place incense is offered to My Name, and a pure oblation ; or

¹ Brown, Driver, and Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 1907.

- (2) In every place [the] smoke [of incense or of sacrifice] is made to arise, an offering is made to My Name, and a pure oblation.

Against the first rendering may be urged that it is unlikely that two adjacent words of the same form should be understood, the one as a noun, the other as a verb. This objection is by no means decisive; Père Lagrange,¹ with Canon van Hoonacker, avoids it altogether by suggesting that the true vocalization is *miqtar*, with the same meaning of 'incense.' This is a possible reading, though the word is not found with this meaning.

Against the second rendering there is the obvious objection of tautology. This difficulty would be removed by suppressing 'and.' Kittel's edition of the Massoretic text suggests that this omission should be made. The conjunction is lacking in twenty-one of the MSS. of Kennicott and de Rossi, as also in the Syriac and Vulgate versions.² Without 'and' the sense would be

- (3) In every place [the] smoke [of incense or of sacrifice] is made to arise, there is offered to My Name a pure oblation.

This *asyndeton* is quite possible. The Syriac and Vulgate, however, read 'and' before 'there is offered.'

The objection raised against (2) may be met in another way. The conjunctive participle in Hebrew sometimes has the force of 'even' or 'and indeed.' This usage is suggested in the present instance by Corluy.³ He compares Zacharias ix. 9, 'riding upon an ass, even upon a colt, the foal of an ass'; Jeremias xv. 13, 'even in all thy borders'; Daniel i. 3, 'even of the king's seed and of the princes.' The translation will then be

- (4) In every place [the] smoke [of incense or of sacrifice] is made to arise, an offering is made to My Name, even a pure oblation.

Here we may leave the question of translation, without

¹ *Revue Biblique*, 1906, p. 80.

² De Rossi, *Variae Lectiones Vet. Test.*; Parma, 1786.

³ *Spicilegium Dogmatico-Biblicum*, 1884, ii. p. 402.

attempting for the present to decide whether *muqtar* refers to the smoke of incense or of sacrifice, as we have for the present left the question whether *minhah* refers specifically to a grain offering or not. In any case, all the terms of the passage are strictly sacrificial. Almighty God declares through His prophet that He will not receive the polluted sacrifices of the Aaronic priesthood, for from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof, that is, throughout the whole world, His Name is great among the Gentiles, and a pure sacrifice is offered to His Name.

What is this pure offering? Are the Prophet's words to be understood literally of the time of speaking? of offerings made at the very time when Malachy wrote? Various explanations have been put forward on the assumption that such is the meaning. First, there is the theory advocated, for example, among the Jews, by the celebrated Rabbi Isaac ben Abraham, and among rationalists by Wellhausen, namely, that the pure oblation Yahweh now regards with favour is identical with the sacrifices offered by the non-Jewish races to their supreme gods, by the Romans to Jupiter, by the Greeks to Zeus, by the Persians to Ahura Mazda. These races may never have identified their supreme deity with the one true God worshipped by the Jews; but inasmuch as the nations paid cult each to a supreme being, they were paying unconscious worship to Yahweh.

Against this syncretistic view there is the grave difficulty that it is entirely against the spirit of the Old Testament. The people of Israel were warned to take no part in the worship of the peoples around them, for, in the words of the Psalmist (Ps. xcvi. (xcvi.) 5) 'all the gods of the Gentiles are devils.' And St. Paul is speaking in entire accord with Jewish tradition when he writes to the Corinthians (1 Cor. x. 20): 'The things which the heathen sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God' (cf. Deut. xxxii. 17). Moreover, Malachy himself is far from showing this toleration of foreigners. His book opens with stern words about the Edomites; and he rebukes marriages

with non-Jews precisely because they worshipped strange gods: 'Juda hath trangressed, and abomination hath been committed in Israel and in Jerusalem: for Juda hath profaned the holiness of the Lord which he loved, and hath married the daughter of a strange god' (Mal. ii. 11). Moreover, Almighty God says: 'My Name is great among the Gentiles'; and if stress may be laid on the 'Name,' it is far from true that the name of Yahweh was great among the Gentile nations. For the most part it was not even known.

Another theory finds the key to a solution in the recently discovered papyrus fragments of Elephantine. The view is held by several of whom we may take Dr. J. M. Powis Smith as the representative.¹ These documents may be conveniently studied in the admirable edition published by A. Cowley.² The very existence of the Jewish military colony at Elephantine was previously unsuspected. We now know that it existed in the time of Cyrus, and probably goes back to Psammetichus II, who reigned from 595-590 B.C. It had its temple to Yahu or Jahô, about the form of whose name there is some doubt, but who is certainly to be identified with Yahweh. This temple was served by a body of priests, who, of course, were responsible for the cult; and we read of meal-offerings, incense, and sacrifices. In explanation of Malachy i. 11, Dr. Powis Smith writes: 'In any case, it is quite evident that the writer of this prophecy may have shared the views of the colonists as to the legitimacy of sacrificial worship upon foreign soil, and may have had such shrines as that at Elephantine in mind when he wrote.' And again: 'There is no necessity for supposing that the action of these colonists in erecting a temple on foreign soil was unique. It is altogether probable that similar shrines were erected in other Jewish centres. The later temple at Heliopolis is a case in point. The same longings and needs that caused

¹ *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Malachi*, 1912, pp. 30-33, in one of the volumes of the *International Critical Commentary*.

² *Jewish Documents of the Time of Ezra*; London, 1919.

the building of the temple at Elephantine existed in many other regions, and may easily have resulted in similar action.'

In Dr. Smith's own translation the text on which he is commenting is 'And in every place, smoke is made to arise to My Name, and a pure offering.' The explanation of a text that refers to *every* place is surely on a weak foundation when it can refer with certainty to but *one* contemporary and *one* later instance. The estimation of probabilities, of course, involves the personal equation; but it is difficult to follow Dr. Smith in his opinion. It cannot be said to be altogether improbable that similar shrines existed elsewhere; but it seems very unlikely that they existed in 'many other regions.' And unless they did exist in many other regions, they do not explain the text. Had they existed in many centres, several at least would have left traces of their existence. Moreover, had they existed in many other regions, the custom of offering sacrifices to Yahweh would not, in all probability, have perished among the Jews, and there would have been some evidence of the practice, especially after the destruction of Jerusalem. It is very doubtful, too, whether Jewish sacrifices offered outside Jerusalem could be regarded as pure oblations, as, by the Deuteronomic law, such sacrifices were strictly forbidden.¹ Again, Malachy opposes to the rejected sacrifices of the Jews sacrifices offered to Yahweh among the Gentiles, and, therefore, in view of the antithesis, offered also by the Gentiles.

As representatives of yet a third view which understands Malachy to be speaking of his own day, we may

¹ The Louvain Professor, Canon A. van Hoonacker, in the Schweich Lectures for 1914, *Une Communauté Judéo-Araméenne à Éléphantine, en Égypte, aux VI^e et V^e siècles av. J.C.* (London, 1915, pp. 60 ff), argues that the law prohibiting sacrifice outside Jerusalem had in view only the land of Canaan: 'On comprend que le souci de la conduite à suivre en dehors du territoire de Canaan devait être ici entièrement étranger au législateur.' He holds, however, that the cult celebrated at Elephantine was irregular on another ground, as going contrary to 'le principe traditionnel qui, indépendamment de toute loi écrite, s'opposait à l'offrande de sacrifices à Jahvé en terre étrangère, à raison de l'impureté de cette terre.'

consider the opinion of Dr. Kirkpatrick.¹ He favours the explanation that 'the Jews of the Dispersion, scattered throughout the world in the midst of the Gentiles, rendered by their offerings of prayer and praise a more acceptable service to Jehovah than the careless priests in the Temple at Jerusalem by their heartless and contemptible sacrifices, and that thereby Jehovah's Name was being magnified among the heathen.' He adds in a note: 'Probably some of the Jews at Jerusalem despised the Jews of the Dispersion (cf. Ezek. xi. 15), and refused to recognize their worship in heathen countries as true worship. They are rebuked by the emphatic declaration that in every place Jehovah can be acceptably worshipped, and that, while His Name is despised in the city of His choice by His own people, it is magnified among the heathen. The words are an anticipation of John iv. 21.'

This explanation of the passage, as referring to the prayer and praise offered by the Jews of the Diaspora was long ago rejected by St. Justin.² It is open to the same objection as the last, namely, that the antithesis favours sacrifices offered not merely among the Gentiles, but by the Gentiles. Moreover, the antithesis suggests that to the real sacrifices of the Jews are opposed the real material sacrifices offered throughout the world. It is inconceivable that the Jews at Jerusalem and in Palestine regarded the spiritual worship offered by their dispersed brethren as being unwelcome to God. In the short time that had elapsed since the return from the Babylonian captivity, the idea could hardly have arisen among the Jews of Palestine that God could not be truly worshipped outside the borders of their country. The idea is the less likely that, as the rebukes of Malachy show, the Jews of Palestine held the Temple worship in small honour. The victims offered were blemished and unworthy, and tithe was not regularly paid. Moreover, the assumption of this interpretation appears to

¹ *The Doctrine of the Prophets*, ed. 3, London, 1915.

² *Dial. cum Tryph.* n. 117.

be that by 'incense' and 'a pure offering' a Hebrew writer such as Malachy could signify a spiritual offering of 'prayer and praise.' This assumption is quite unwarranted by the Old Testament. There incense is never used in its later metaphorical sense, nor is *minhah* ever used in a purely spiritual sense. It always represents some material offering.

There is still a fourth explanation which supposes that the Prophet is speaking of his own time. According to this view, Malachy refers to the Gentile proselytes, who had turned from their pagan cult, and worshipped the one true God. It is unnecessary to spend time in the refutation of this suggestion, as it is doubtful whether it is held by any scholar at the present day. We have no reason for supposing that there were such numerous proselytes in the fifth century B.C.; and in any case several of the objections urged above are applicable here also.

If the arguments adduced above are valid, it follows that Malachy cannot be speaking of his own time; for the hypotheses enumerated seem to exhaust the possible contemporary references. If the Prophet is not speaking of the pagans, nor of the Jews of the Diaspora, nor of the Gentile proselytes of his day, his point of reference must be in the future. This interpretation is suggested, moreover, by the acceptance of sacrifice from the Gentiles. Their inclusion is one of the best-known traits of the Messianic kingdom, and of the prophecies that refer to it (Isai. xlix. 6; Ps. xxi. (xxii.) 27, 28; Ps. lxxi. (lxxii.) 8-11). Grammatically the Hebrew may be understood of the present, as in the text of the Revised Version, or of the future, as in the Authorized Version. If the text is understood grammatically of the present, this passage is another instance of the *futurum instans*¹ of which Malachy himself makes use more than once (ii. 3, iii. 1). The Prophet has the picture of the future so vividly before him that he speaks of it as present and accomplished fact (cf. Isai. vii. 14).

¹ Cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley, *Hebrew Grammar*, § 116 p.

To sum up, then, the sense requires the future, and the grammar allows it.

The argument so far may be stated thus : Malachy foretells a real sacrifice in the future, offered by the non-Jewish races, and acceptable to Yahweh. In place of the Aaronic sacrifices is to be substituted a non-Aaronic sacrifice ; in place of the sacrifices offered by the Jews sacrifice offered by the Gentiles ; and in place of their polluted offerings a clean oblation which is to be offered no longer in Jerusalem alone, but throughout the world, from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof. This sacrifice can be none other than the sacrifice of the Mass. No other is to be found which fits the prophecy.

Hence the Church, through the Council of Trent, declares in its teaching on the Mass : ‘ *Haec quidem illa munda oblatio est, quae nulla indignitate aut malitia offerentium inquinari potest ; quam Dominus per Malachiam nomini suo, quod magnum futurum esset in gentibus, in omni loco mundam offerendam praedixit.*’¹

As St. Augustine has pointed out in another connexion² that which is obscure in a prophetic utterance is rightly interpreted in the light of that which is clear. This principle indicates the solution of the two questions which were left unanswered in the earlier part of this paper. These two questions were whether *minhah* refers specifically to a grain offering, and whether *muqtar* refers to the smoke of incense or of sacrifice. Once it is established that the prophecy foretells the world-wide and necessarily pure oblation of the sacrifice of the Mass, which is offered under the species of bread and of wine, the answer to the first question cannot remain in doubt. This does not mean to say that the word explicitly connotes a grain offering. In itself it is undetermined ; and can be determined only by the context. This specific meaning of ‘ grain offering ’ is not here necessarily indicated by the wording of the text, but the fulfilment of the prophecy in history shows what is the nature of the offering intended.

The second question likewise receives its solution from the fulfilment of the prophecy in history. Throughout the world, whenever the ritual of the Holy Sacrifice is solemnly celebrated, the use of incense is an integral portion of the service. Hence, relying on St. Augustine's principle, which, indeed, does not require authority for its support, we are justified in seeing in the word *muqtar* a prediction of the use of incense in the central act of Christian worship. So Father Knabenbauer¹: '*Prophetia ad litteram impletur. Si autem talis est impletio, cur eandem esse praedictionem asserere dubitabis?*'

Of course it does not follow from the prophecy of Malachy that the use of incense and the pure oblation will always be combined in the same service. The passage certainly suggests that the use of incense will accompany the offering of the pure oblation, but there is nothing in the passage to suggest that it will always be so, and that the two cannot be separated. Again, we know from the historic fulfilment of the prophecy that the use of incense is not restricted to the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice. Indeed, it is quite possible that the use of incense was introduced, for example, in the burial service before it was introduced in the Mass. The early evidence is not sufficiently clear to allow of a certain answer to the question whether incense was used in the ritual of the first three centuries. Cardinal Bona is of opinion that the liturgical use of incense has its origin in Apostolic tradition, and its pattern in the services of the Jewish Temple. However, this opinion is not generally adopted; and the prophecy of Malachy does not necessarily imply that the new sacrifice and the use of incense in the new cult are to be instituted at the same time.

EDMUND SUTCLIFFE, S.J.

¹ *Commentarius in Proph. Min.*, 1886, ii. p. 440.

THE ETHICS OF JOURNALISM

BY REV. DAVID BARRY

ALTHOUGH the duties of various other professional men are treated with considerable detail in the text-books of moral theology, those of journalists are not dealt with of set purpose at all, but merely referred to incidentally, for instance, in the treatise on co-operation. This omission is easily explained by the fact that journalism, if known at all as we understand it, was the occupation of exceedingly few when the classical moralists wrote; and its influence on the lives and interests of the community generally was not very noticeable. Indeed, it is only quite recently that it was recognized as a profession by any of the Universities and accorded a place in their curricula.

It is clear, however, that at present the power of the Press over the welfare of society and individuals can scarcely be exaggerated, and that there is every reason why it should be considered one of the estates of the realm. In former times the ruling classes were independent, irresponsible, and so secure in their privileges that they had no need to defer to, or consider, the opinions of the newspapers or their readers, who, in any case, were comparatively few.¹ But nowadays, generally speaking, it is, at least in the last resort, the people that rule. Though, of course, certain coteries sometimes so entrench themselves in the seats of government that they are almost of necessity chosen as the depositaries or organs of the people's authority—an extreme instance of which is, or was until recently, furnished by the Spanish parliamentary system. So that, in point of fact, they are often in a position to nullify or

¹ Though it is true that as long ago as 1712 the increasing influence and popularity of the newspapers were so disliked by the English Government of the day that it imposed a tax of a halfpenny on papers of half a sheet and less, and of a penny on those between half a sheet and a sheet.

deflect the popular will from its proper object ; and the sway of undiluted democracy is never likely to be more than an ideal or a dream. But though this is true, at least lip service has to be paid to the people's views, and they have to be reckoned with and obeyed to a greater or less extent ; or if not, they must be moulded by the ruling castes or juntas. And where is the medium so suitable for finding out what the public is thinking, and altering the current of its thoughts, if necessary, as the Press ?

And the more a person examines the matter, the more forcibly will it be brought home to him how much the generality of people rely on their favourite paper, and how largely indebted they are to it for their stock of information. The expense and trouble that those ambitious of public favour are prepared to incur, in order to have an organ of their own or one sympathetic with their claims, are evidence enough of this. And a more conclusive or tangible proof is the rush or scrimmage to secure the papers when they reach the provincial or rural districts of our own country for some time past. Of course, in regard to matters of fact outside our particular sphere, there are no other channels of information open to us. While as to policies and theories of statecraft on which every elector is supposed to have a guiding voice, having little knowledge of past or contemporary history, or the subterranean forces that go to make it, we are glad to have our minds made up for us without any qualms or hesitation by the Press. Without the breadth of vision or penetration that would enable us to appreciate principles instead of persons, and being anxious to have a highly coloured picture before us, we often accept gladly and without question whomsoever our paper recommends as the custodian of the nation's interests. We are prepared, at its bidding, to revere or venerate him for his good qualities, being as oblivious of his weaknesses as we are of what may be said in favour of his rival, who is sometimes presented to us as almost the incarnation of evil.

Indeed, politics and politicians—I am not speaking of

patriots and patriotism—have of themselves a strange hold on people, the origin of which the psychologists or political philosophers might well investigate. Whatever be the explanation of it, I do not believe that it is *entirely* motived by love of country, and the consequent desire to entrust its destinies to the hands of the most worthy and competent. However, the fact is that the public is so infatuated with politics that it is scarcely possible for a newspaper to live without popularizing some brand of them; and if it were to eschew them altogether, it would scarcely have a larger circulation, relatively speaking, than a novel without a love interest. So that the Press and politics second each other's appeal for popularity. And a public man, with a highly efficient propaganda on his behalf in the newspapers, can scarcely overestimate his prospects of success.

The influence of the Press having attained such dimensions in political questions, which largely regulate social ones, and growing almost *pari passu* with the emancipation of the masses, it is clear that a sound and operative public opinion regarding the claims of religion and morality can hardly be hoped for, if the exhortations from the pulpit on Sunday, and the edifying example given by those who are comparatively few, have to withstand a debased tone and scandalous reports in the papers to which nearly all have access every day. Except in the case of the strongest and most determined, the moral atmosphere in which we live is almost everything, and it is our public journals that very largely make that atmosphere.

Well, I think the obligations that journalists are most liable to transgress, and to injure their readers by transgressing, are those arising from the Eighth Commandment, and from the law of charity that binds us to consult the welfare of our neighbour's soul and to avoid giving him scandal. And in reference to the former class of these duties, I may say that Pressmen have not much temptation to be guilty of absolute and downright falsehood; for this would almost of a certainty be unmasked by their rivals, and so bring

its own retribution. Though, if I mistake not, there have been instances, which I need not particularize, where such a terrible calamity as war was almost, if not quite, precipitated through unblushing and categorical misstatements of fact by some of the newspapers. However, the danger rather is that circumstances would dispose them to deal in half-truths, and to paint a distorted picture of events and opinions—local, national, or international.

And this, which seems to be a principal aim of the more unscrupulous organs, is chiefly due to the connexion between the Press and politics that I alluded to already. Because few public men can hope to retain that unquestioning, undeviating, and undiscerning support of their followers, which is vital to supreme success, if they allow them recourse to a full knowledge of the personalities that they are opposing or of the issues at stake. So to the Press that they control, or that now and then controls them, it is vital to conceive and present a picture of public events that is altogether out of perspective. The papers cannot well tell a whole untruth, or completely suppress the truth, but there is a great danger that they would be sometimes very economical in telling it.

Now for a few instances of the partisanship and unfairness that propaganda of the kind in question is responsible for. It is not an unknown thing for newspapers to refer to the taking of human life *by those who support their side* as an incident or an affray; it is seldom the least reputable ones go so far as to call it a tragedy. And as for condemnation of such an outrage, there are occasions when the most one can expect is to see it characterized as regrettable, or to be deprecated, or something equally colourless. Indeed, horrors are sometimes relegated to an obscure corner, not to avoid shocking the feelings and consciences of Christians; but, as if to show that they were of little or no consequence, and merely the outcome of the normal volume of human greed or passion. Whereas, if they were shown up and stigmatized as they ought to be, they would arouse such abhorrence and execration as would

help materially to remove the temptation to others to do anything similar. Again, there is an instance in recent journalism where, after a bomb had been thrown into a crowd of unoffending, defenceless people, we were told that it *fell* amongst them; and we should doubtless be given no information at all, if the more audacious course of complete suppression were found to answer.

Such palliation of crime, and attempted disguise of its more revolting features, are calculated to degrade the minds, mislead the consciences, and brutalize and harden the feelings of the people; and are evidence of as much malice towards the body corporate as a poisoner shows towards his particular victim. And all the malice attaching to lies which is found in them, is their least objectionable element.

On the other hand, it is only a little less baleful if a newspaper, in order to discredit parties or persons that are its enemies, exaggerates the disagreeable features of some incident for which they are responsible. Yet one not infrequently finds that a mere scuffle or squabble is referred to as blackguardism that savages would not be guilty of; or a measure of justifiable self-defence, as murder most foul.

A third way in which the truth is occasionally prejudiced is by misrepresenting the state of public opinion. For instance, by making it appear as if the particular views cherished by the controllers of a paper were the convictions of the country, as a whole; in other words, by giving the impression that it is following, whereas as a fact it is leading or manufacturing, public opinion. A journal is, of course, entitled to try to make its views prevail, and to get them accepted by the nation. But only on condition of using honest arguments in their favour; not by the subterfuge of representing that what is to the interest of an individual or a section, or what is machined, is the spontaneous sentiment of the public. An allied abuse of the readers' confidence is, while correctly stating that an opinion has been embraced by a certain body, carefully to conceal the fact that it was opposed by a large or considerable minority.

An eminent literary man and good friend of Ireland said recently that the chief qualification of a successful journalist was an unlicensed imagination. Well, the principal duty of a conscientious one is to keep his imagination within the bounds of truth and justice, and in close and constant touch with facts. It is only by a strong and persevering effort against the dead weight of bias and partisanship, that a publicist can preserve intellectual freedom and nimbleness enough to give fair play to all persons and parties. Journalists are, or should be, in a greater degree than, perhaps, any other class of the laity, the guardians of national honour and character, and they ought to be scrupulously mindful of this trust when they come forward to mark out its path for the nation.

Turning now to the rights of individuals under the Eighth Commandment, it has to be admitted at once that public men, with whom the newspapers are for the most part concerned, freely present themselves for judgment; and by pressing their claims on us, not only invite criticism, but voluntarily divest themselves of the shield with which justice and charity protect those who lead a private life.¹ This, of course, does not justify anyone in calumniating them, nor palliate his offence in doing so. But real failings or defects of character that are apt directly to hinder the discharge of the duties of a position they hold, or are aspiring to, may be legitimately pointed out, and indeed ought to be, in the public interest. However, theoretically speaking, moral faults that are in no way prejudicial to their competence, must be as jealously kept secret as if they were private individuals. But, in practice, it is very hard to draw such a line of demarcation, for we cannot conveniently parcel out a man's life into two exclusive categories: one regarding himself alone, the other concerned with his neighbours and the public generally. And a person who, in private, is leading a life grossly unworthy of a Christian, is giving conclusive proof that it would be disastrous to

¹ Noldin, *De Præceptis*, n. 638.

entrust him with a responsibility in regard to others. But 'publicists merit the severest condemnation who, through an obsession for revealing everything, or through party spirit disclose compromising matters, the knowledge of which has nothing to do with the good of society.'¹

Moreover, in opposing the policy of a public man, it is not legitimate for a journalist to impute sordid and selfish motives to him, without the conclusive proof that he is seldom in a position to obtain. Though such criticism, while sinful and injurious in intention, may in fact entail little harm, and so not give rise to the obligation of restitution. For the reason that some will not take much notice of it, as mistrusting the object of the journalist in making it; and others, because of the low estimation in which they already hold the incriminated individual or the generality of public men. However, should the duty of restoring some one's good name arise, it must be discharged adequately and readily, and not in the grudging and niggardly spirit in which the papers sometimes acknowledge a mistake—as if they feared that the fallibility of their judgment or their information would be brought home to their readers. Equity similarly demands that one whose conduct has been censured, should be given a fair opportunity of rebutting the strictures that have been passed on him.

There is nothing, of course, in the Eighth Commandment to forbid the use of such well-recognized—and so fully discounted—journalistic devices as hailing the champions of one's own side as statesmen and patriots, and characterizing their opponents as mere politicians, agitators and demagogues. Though it is well to bear in mind that a person may be guilty of calumny or detraction not only through direct statement or through innuendo, but also by being any one of the following: 'Imponens, augens, manifestans, in mala vertens. Qui negat, aut minuet, reticet, laudatque remisse.'

In regard to institutions or societies, calumnies circulated

¹ Noldin, op. cit., n. 641.

against them are especially heinous and cowardly, as they are unusually frequent. Because generally these semi-public bodies cannot vindicate their character by an action in the courts, either because individuals are not directly affected, or because the accusations are not definite and tangible enough to give any material for refutation or for impeaching those who make them, though they may be definite and poisonous enough seriously to damage an institution and its members in the eyes of their fellow-men.

In order to enforce and complete what I have said as to the obligations of journalists towards an individual, I may refer the reader to Lehmkuhl's treatment of the allied duties of historians.¹ According to him, the secret crimes of a dead person may be made known by a historian, in the first place, if this be necessary in order to reinstate in the public estimation one who has been robbed of his character. Secondly, such disclosure may be lawful with a view to undermining the baleful authority and influence of one whose name, even after his death, is a power for evil. And, on the other hand, a writer need not have much scruple in portraying the evil character of one who has previously quite lost caste in the eyes of decent persons. Again, if it be necessary or very serviceable for people generally that anything be committed to writing, the defamation of one or more thereby involved need not be taken account of.² Finally, by reason of the rage that exists at the present day for dragging everything into the glare of the public judgment, Lehmkuhl holds that it may often be better that delicate matters, which ought by right to be shrouded in eternal oblivion, should be justly and impartially set forth by an honest writer, than that a false and prejudiced account of them by the unscrupulous should be alone permitted currency.

It is the case, too, that the theologians³ allow that

¹ *Theologia Moralis*, i. nn. 1426 and 1427 (11th ed.).

² St. Thomas apud Sanctum Alphonsum, *Theologia Moralis*, lib. iii. n. 968.

³ Tanqueray, *Theologia Moralis*, ii. n. 382, note.

long after a person's death, when his family would be unaffected, his secret sins may be divulged for little other reason than as affording an example to be avoided.

Lehmkuhl gives the much needed warning that if publicists see fit to disclose the errors of anyone, they ought to be careful to say that he repented of them, and did his best to make up for them, if this were the case. Although the fact that a person is stated to have adequately atoned for his sins is not by itself a justification for revealing them.

The same author,¹ speaking of the detraction or calumny of which a number of persons is the object, holds, that to say of a city that there are many wicked men in it, and even to specify the crime of which they are guilty, is not a serious matter; because no particular person is affected. But he says the matter is different if there be question of a monastery: for the reason that in this hypothesis the individuals are compromised to the extent, at any rate, that each of them falls under serious suspicion. However, I personally believe that, prescinding altogether from the case of individuals, slandering or libelling a moral body, such as a religious Order, is itself a grievous sin and a gross violation of justice and charity.

A controversy at present² proceeding in England directs attention to another branch of the Eighth Commandment—that relating to the keeping of secrets. 'A high authority' is alleged to have made known, in March, 1919, to Mr. Sisley Huddleston, the Paris correspondent of the *Westminster Gazette*, for publication in his newspaper, that it was 'the authentic British view'—as opposed apparently to the French one—that the terms imposed on Germany should be confined to such limits as were consistent with a just or practicable peace. 'The high authority,' however, stipulated that his name should not be mentioned in the despatch. When the Prime Minister, as a result of the publication of it, was taxed by 370 members of Parliament with harbouring such 'criminal' sentiments, he complained

¹ Op. cit., n. 1421, 6.

² See *The Times* of April 1 and 3.

that the article was represented as emanating from a 'reliable source,' and 'denied the authenticity—or at least produced the impression of denying the authenticity'—of its information.

Now, after three years, the correspondent has stated that Mr. George himself was 'the high authority' and the source of the information. Assuming this to be true, was Mr. Huddleston justified in making it known, in violation of the promise or understanding as to secrecy? His own view is that: 'If a statesman has something to say, let him say it in his own name. If he does not wish it to be published he is not obliged to talk to journalists. It is, in my opinion, a very debatable point whether a journalist should respect the confidence of a statesman who without being obliged to tell him anything, goes out of his way to do so. However, this is not the place or time to discuss such a matter.' The opinion of Mr. Harold Spender,¹ the well-known journalist, on the subject is that

The Minister is not bound to reveal the whole of his mind, but that part of it which he does reveal must be his real mind, and not a pretence thrown out to test opinion. And when the Pressman has faithfully reported what was plainly intended for the public he must not be liable to a *démenti*, or his paper be rebuked for disseminating false or untrustworthy news. These observations . . . suggest the solution of the problem which Mr. Huddleston raises. The Press should submit to no conditions—and none should be laid down—which bind it to silence when these unwritten laws are broken. If the Press is invited on the assumption that what is said may be laid before the public, if it does this honestly and fairly, and is then disowned or rebuked, it must be permitted to retort by revealing the sources of its information. Public men are very free with these rebukes, when they think themselves injured, and when newspapers are injured (as they are very seriously by an undeserved rebuke) they, too, must be free to defend themselves. Whether journalists, after accepting conditions which ought not to be imposed, should be permitted to break them on the ground that the public interest requires it, is another and more difficult question.

In the terminology of Catholic moralists information of the kind in question is not only a *secretum promissum* but a *secretum commissum*; that is to say, one in which a

¹ See the *Westminster Gazette*, of April 3.

pledge of secrecy, express or implied, is a condition of its communication. And, though authors are not unanimous on all points, it may be taken as generally accepted that such can be revealed to avert a serious loss to a person himself, to another, or through consideration for the public welfare. So, in the case under discussion, the reputation of the correspondent for honesty and of his paper for reliable news, not to speak at all of the possible public advantage accruing from the disclosure of all the facts, would seem to be sufficient justification for his apparent breach of faith.

St. Thomas,¹ however, allows the invasion of a secret of this kind only when preserving it would be a sin. And Lehmkuhl,² with his usual caution, and no doubt having his eye on the teaching of the Angelic Doctor, tells us that the difficulty of sanctioning such disclosure increases proportionately to the clearness of the demand made, and the emphasis of the assurance given, that confidence would be respected.

Coming now to the question of giving bad example, just as it is necessary that scandals should come, so it is almost inevitable that journalism should often be the vehicle of them. The publication of every crime is, no doubt, more or less likely to lead those who are weak to its commission, by familiarizing their minds with it, lessening their abhorrence of it, and showing them that the perpetration of it is not unthinkable. Furthermore, the means adopted to attain the evil end may be revealed, and to this extent, put within their reach. But I think it is the publishing of sins against the Sixth Commandment that is most deleterious to good morals. For the strong arm of the law, and the other defences with which society hedges itself round, are a great deterrent in the case of many other crimes. Neither is delicacy of thought and imagination—so easily offended by unsavoury reading—equally vital to one anxious to avoid them.

¹ Quodlib. i. art. 15, v. f.

² Op. cit., 1444, 2.

Now, the publication of breaches of the Commandment in question is sometimes defended on two grounds. In the first place, it is contended that the fear of the shame and disgrace incidental to publicity exerts a wholesome and restraining influence on those whose sense of propriety is not quite dead. But, as against this, I think it is true to say that very few, when tempted in this way, put as a counterpoise to the allurements the fact that, if they fall, the newspapers may get hold of the information. Such a motive is too remote and uncertain to have much weight at the critical moment of decision. And, in any case, it does not explain the publication of the unsavoury or nauseous details that sometimes appear, e.g., in the reports of divorce and breach of promise cases. There is more strength in the second line of defence, which is that, even if Catholic journalists were not to publish these cases, non-Catholics would; and so—human nature being what it is—people generally, not excepting Catholics, would buy the papers which present them without any reserve or censorship at all. However, I am convinced that this assumption is unwarranted, and shows an unjustifiable mistrust of Catholics. For if the reputable organs of the Press left such scandals severely alone, most people would follow their lead; and would be ashamed to purchase the papers in which they are never sure that revolting stories, hurtful to their own purity and innocence or those of their children, will not be obtruded on them. In proportion as a strict censorship is exercised on topics injurious to faith or morals, and there is a clear and consistent distinction between the ways Catholics and non-Catholics treat these subjects, our people are likely to be reluctant to patronize papers that cater for sensation or pander to a debased taste.

At all events, it is important for journalists to realize that reporting these lecherous cases cannot be defended on the plea of whetting the legitimate curiosity of the public, or as a warning against the commission of sin. Its sole justification or palliation is to be looked for in the financial return due to the appeal this species of journalism

makes to the cruder sentiments or lower instincts of the public.

In conclusion, I may excuse my handling of this very important subject, which I am conscious is somewhat jejune and incomplete, by the fact, I alluded to at the beginning, viz., that I had no fundamental or systematic treatment of it in the text-books for my guidance.

DAVID BARRY.

NOTES AND QUERIES

THEOLOGY

BOYCOTTING AND EXCLUSIVE DEALING. THE OWNERSHIP OF MASS HONORARIA

REV. DEAR SIR,—Perhaps you would say something on two matters that have given me some trouble :—

1°. In my neighbourhood, boycotting and exclusive dealing, on a mild scale, are not unknown. We have discussed the whole thing at length many a time. I must say that in some of the cases I have sympathized with the action taken. But it has been urged, in private controversy and also in some articles I have read, that the people who refuse to deal with a particular merchant are asking two prices, 1°, the value of their money, 2°, the right to compel him to do what they want. If there is a satisfactory reply on moral principles, will you kindly tell me what it is ?

2°. Am I free to treat as my own the Mass Honoraria I receive (free to invest the money or lodge it in a bank) *before* I have said the Masses. I sometimes think that, as I have not yet fulfilled the contract, and as there is an obligation attached to the ownership (if any), the money is not mine in the full sense and that the ‘species negotiationis’ forbidden by the Codex covers my case. It would relieve me to know that it is not so.

PAROCHUS.

I

The argument quoted by ‘Parochus’ appeals so strongly to some that they give up the position entirely and denounce boycotting, in every shape and form, as essentially unlawful. If *they* were asked what reply should be given, they would simply state that there was no reply whatsoever. They number very intelligent men in their ranks : no authoritative decision has ever been given on the point ; we must, therefore, admit it as conceivable that ‘Parochus’ can never find a satisfactory answer to his query.

But, we think, only just conceivable. For it would seem to us that the answer can be easily found by ‘Parochus’ and by everyone else who is prepared to view the matter impartially. The so-called ‘second price’ is no price at all : it represents no special concession on the part of the victim of the boycott ; it only means the fulfilment of the fundamental conditions of civilized intercourse. Before any contract is entered into, these conditions are essential : there is, therefore, no injustice in insisting upon them before business relations are admitted. If a man

enters the Stock Exchange, dressed as a sweep or not dressed at all, he will find it hard to do business—not because the members are looking for a double price, but because before accepting *any* price, they insist on a compliance with convention and decency. If a grimy resident of the underworld offers you his hand in the name of equality and fraternity, you will not be accused of injustice if you ask him to wash it first. And so, if a man persists in a grossly inequitable course of conduct, he may be asked without injustice to put himself on a moral level with the other members of the community before his money or his goods are accepted.

In fact it is he that has started the 'double-price' policy. He practically states: 'For my money and goods I claim the ordinary commercial return; I insist, moreover, on being allowed to obstruct the interests of the whole community.' While the boycotters insist on a natural right, *he* puts in claims that no self-respecting community can tolerate. That is the only difference between them.

II

'Parochus' second suggestion is not well founded. A contract is not 'fulfilled' until both parties have carried out their obligations: but as a rule it is 'complete' when the obligations have been undertaken, and again, as a rule, it is at that point that ownership passes. There are complications introduced by positive law, but they do not concern us now. In the case of honoraria the ownership passes as soon as the money is transferred. 'There is an obligation attached to the ownership.' True, but that does not annul the ownership. If we once admitted the opposite, we should have to deny that anyone is owner of anything—for every ownership has its duties as well as its rights. The Code, we grant, prohibits even the 'appearance' of dealing and trafficking: but we may reasonably understand the reference to be to the practice of collecting honoraria in great numbers and having the Masses said at a lower rate elsewhere, or to those dealings with booksellers, etc., that have left their trace in so many pronouncements. If only the due number is accepted, and if those remaining at the end of the year are transferred, 'Parochus' need have no fear of ecclesiastical censure. Above all, he may take it for certain that his claim to ownership is unimpeachable.

IRISH MATRIMONIAL FACULTIES

REV. DEAR SIR,—I have read your comments (I. E. RECORD, May, 1921), on the Matrimonial faculties granted to the Irish Bishops on the 1st February, 1921. The matter is rather complicated. So you will pardon me if I direct your attention to a few points on which I should like to have some further information. The document is vague in regard to some of the degrees: and I find it hard to decide when a case of 'urgency' arises. Would you kindly give me your views on the following points:—

1°. In your previous reply you say that 'the third degree mixed

with the second probably does remain a minor impediment' (p. 519). Is that probability sufficient to justify a Bishop in giving a dispensation, when the cause is 'just and reasonable' but not 'grave and urgent'?

2°. Who is to decide whether a cause is 'grave and urgent' or not?

3°. What constitutes a 'grave and urgent cause'?

A reply will oblige.

M. H.

Taking 'M. H.'s' queries in order:—

1°. The probability in the case was, we think, quite sufficient as a basis for action. Faculties of this kind are of wide interpretation (50, 85). When a fair case can be made out in favour of their application to a particular case, it is certainly the intentions of the legislator that the power be utilized and no scruples entertained.

But we can give 'M. H.' a further assurance. Since we gave the reply he quotes, we have consulted an authority in close touch with the workings of the Roman Congregations. We do not consider ourselves justified in quoting his reply in full. But it leaves no doubt on the matter. The 'third degree mixed with the second' *certainly* 'remains a minor impediment.' The Bishop may, therefore, act when the cause is 'just and reasonable'—which means in practice that he may dispense at any time, once the cause reaches the standard required for dispensations generally.

2°. Manifestly the Ordinary himself is the judge in the case. To look to higher authorities would involve the very danger and delay that the concession was designed to obviate.

Nor need he be troubled by any great anxiety or scruple. It is an established principle that, when there is doubt as to whether the cause is sufficient or not, a dispensation may be granted validly and lawfully (84, § 2). When the Ordinary, therefore, has good reason for suspecting that a case of urgency has arisen, even though he is not at all certain of the fact, he may proceed with a quiet conscience.

3°. Before these Faculties were issued, there was a tendency on the part of the commentators to stress pretty strongly both conditions specified in Canon 1,045, § 1, viz., 1°, that all preparations should have been made for the marriage; 2°, that the delay involved in an application to Rome should entail probable danger of grave misfortunes. The practical policy, however, of the Congregation of the Sacraments indicated less rigour than the commentators were inclined to think necessary. In the November (1920) issue of the I. E. RECORD¹ we were allowed to publish a reply received by His Eminence Cardinal Logue in reference to a case in which *no* preparations had been made for the marriage before the impediment was detected. It left no doubt that, when the second

¹ P. 408. 'Super a se concessa dispensatione Ordinarius acquiescat, et deinceps quoties matrimonium nequeat differri absque gravis mali periculo Ordinarius dispensando utatur iure suo.'

condition was amply fulfilled, the first might be allowed to fall into the background.

That is still more clear since the special Faculties were granted. There is no mention whatever of preparations made for the ceremony. All that is required is that 'there be danger in delay,' and that 'the marriage cannot be postponed until a dispensation has been secured from the Holy See.'¹ Some fixing of the marriage date, of course, there must be—else no one can know whether there is 'urgency' or not. But, beyond that, 'preparations' may be left out of account. This is how matters will generally develop. The parties ask, or the circumstances suggest, that the ceremony take place within a certain period. The priest in charge finds that a Roman dispensation cannot be secured in time. When the circumstances warrant, he will suggest a postponement. If the suggestion be accepted, all is well—there is no need for emergency methods. If it be rejected, or if the circumstances do not warrant the suggestion, the case of 'urgency' has arisen. To put the matter more in detail, the condition is fulfilled :—

1°. When, even with the best will on the part of the individuals concerned, grave trouble is bound to arise if the marriage is not contracted soon. We may suppose, for instance, that the neighbours have come to know of the event. If delay occurs, questions will be asked, and the questions cannot be answered without danger to the parties' reputation. In the circumstances, there is no course open except to grant the dispensation at once, and have the marriage proceed in accordance with public expectation.

2°. When with a fair amount of good will on their part, it is still found desirable to protect them from dangers that, absolutely speaking, they could avoid. The most obvious case is that of emigrants who intend leaving the place within the next week or fortnight. In theory matters may be postponed indefinitely : in practice, it will be found advisable to have the ceremony before their departure.

3°. When, through the want of good will on their part, delay would likely lead to a civil marriage or to a life of concubinage. Undoubtedly, they have only themselves to blame ; the remedy is in their own hands, and the case is not *so* urgent as the two just described. But, after all, the dispensing authority has to view these matters from the objective stand-point. His concern is with the existence of the crisis, not with the causes that have brought it about. Once there is 'danger in delay,' it makes little difference whether the unsatisfactory situation is due to the ill will of the parties or to circumstances over which they have no control. The condition required by the law is fulfilled : and 'when the law makes no distinction, neither should we.'

To some this may seem a rather wide interpretation of the term 'urgent.' But the principles mentioned are, we have good reason for saying, the principles by which the Congregation of the Sacraments is guided in practice.

¹ See I. E. RECORD, May, 1921, p. 539.

GOODS SENT ON APPROVAL

REV. DEAR SIR,—On very many occasions during the last twelve or fifteen years, I have received samples of goods from men with whom I had no previous business dealings. Sometimes there was a request that I should return them in case I could give no orders; generally, however, nothing was added to the circular recommending the goods. Sometimes, too, charitable institutions have sent me copies of famous pictures and other objects of the kind, with a request for return if I did not buy. And I need not add that publishers have sent me copies of papers and magazines for which I had given no order.

For a time I did return these things, but in the end it became a nuisance, and I neglected. Individually they were not of very great value, but in the aggregate they would fetch a considerable sum. Am I bound to make restitution? Perhaps you would give me the principles that separate justice from charity in these matters.

SUBSCRIBER.

Abstracting from certain contingencies to be mentioned later, we can have no hesitation in saying that, as a rule, there is no obligation in strict justice to make restitution in the cases specified by our correspondent. The claims of charity, though, are wider and will often impose duties when justice fails.

The difference, as we need hardly remind 'Subscriber,' arises from the fact that charity is based on union, strict justice on separation and independence. When we speak of the claims of charity, we regard the human race as one family, bound together as the children of one common father, and sharing in the obligations which such a union naturally entails. The concept survives to some extent when questions of legal or distributive justice arise. But when we come to strict, commutative justice, we take our stand on another principle—very different from the first, but equally well-based and almost equally important—the principle of each man's essential independence and individual responsibility. No man is created to be the servant or slave of another: though our actions affect, and are in turn affected by, the general welfare, our lot is not merged in the common destiny; as individuals we work out our salvation, as individuals we shall be judged in the end, and as individuals we may claim the rights that our separate responsibility involves. When we view ourselves under that aspect, we find we are often obliged to refrain from interfering with another's actions, but we never find ourselves bound to do anything positive in his service—the ideas of independence and subservience are mutually contradictory. And it is under that aspect precisely that we must view ourselves when we speak of strict justice and obligations of restitution.

That is, of course, provided we have preserved our independence. Our position of isolation and equality may be lost through our own action:

it may be modified also by competent public authority. And, therefore, an obligation to do something positive—and that, too, in strict justice—may arise :—

1°. From contract. That is pretty obvious. When we freely promise to do something for another, whether gratuitously or in return for something given, we forfeit our position of isolation to that extent, and no appeals to the principle of independence will be of any avail until the promise is kept and equality restored. But the change must be due to our own action. No private outsider has any right to claim our services without our own consent. He may, indeed, bring about a condition of things in which the higher virtue of charity will oblige us to help him out of difficulty. But then we have travelled beyond the boundaries of *justice*.

2°. From injury inflicted. This follows from the same principles. Justice demands equality and independence. By robbing our neighbour of his rights, or by preventing him from exercising those he still retains, we interfere with that equality and independence. Until matters are set right by positive action on our part, the level cannot be regained nor the claims of justice satisfied.

3°. From an enactment by public authority. By an exercise of 'overlordship,' both Church and State may in certain circumstances make as strict a demand of an individual as any creditor could. The Church does it, for instance, when she enjoins the *Missa pro populo*; the State, according to a few theologians, when it imposes taxes. How far the authority may be, or has been, exercised has never been definitely settled. Nor is that wonderful : we are getting on to the border-land cases where the principle of 'general welfare' is gradually encroaching on the essential principle of 'independence.' The matter is one in which there is still ample room for theological development, but we can afford to pass it by for the present.

Outside these three cases it is impossible, we think, to specify any circumstances in which a person is bound to positive action on the fundamental principle of justice. 'Subscriber's' case lies outside all three. He has made no contract with the sender of the articles or periodicals—has not asked him to forward them, nor bound himself in any way to return them in case they were actually sent. He has done him no injury : so far as the evidence goes, his attitude has been entirely passive. And certainly there is no positive law binding him to act as agent for any member of the public that chooses to force commodities upon him. If he, therefore, perseveres in his passive attitude, he cannot be accused of violating any obligation imposed by strict justice.

But we can easily suppose circumstances in which a different answer would have to be given. A magazine publisher, for instance, informs his subscribers that, after the present period of subscription has elapsed, their names will remain on the list unless they give notice to the opposite. In view of all the circumstances, the arrangement is perhaps as reasonable as any that could be suggested. When no notice has been given, and the magazine has been sent for another period, is the subscriber free to repudiate all obligation on the ground that he has not renewed the contract ?

Very few, we think, would sustain his contention. His tacit acceptance of the condition, coupled with his tacit acceptance of the volumes when they come, constitute a real contract. Agreements may be implicit, as well as explicit, and acts are more eloquent than words.

Or, suppose that 'Subscriber' has himself been in the habit of sending out samples of his wares, and that the individual with whom he is now concerned has invariably returned them when no further business was undertaken. May the latter not assume that, as a result of this practice, a tacit arrangement, sufficient as basis of a contract, exists between them? We are inclined to think so. But the case, we admit, is more dubious than the other. A man may do many generous things without establishing a claim in justice to similar treatment in return. The most we can say for certain is that the claim is somewhat stronger than one of charity. It amounts to one of equity, and would, we are sure, be recognized and acknowledged in the great majority of cases.

And, as we said in the beginning, when justice and equity fail, charity will often come to the rescue. Many firms, no doubt, dispense even with this: they send out their goods on chance, and are prepared to stand by the consequences. Not so with all. As a last resource, articles of considerable value are often forwarded by people who can ill afford the loss—and they are generally accompanied by an appeal that, if the receiver cannot afford to purchase, he will do his best to return them. In such cases the claims of charity will not be disregarded. Unless the expenses involved are comparatively heavy, the articles will be returned by everyone who acknowledges Catholic principles.

M. J. O'DONNELL.

CANON LAW

A BISHOP'S POWER TO PRESCRIBE THE APPLICATION OF MASS FOR A SPECIFIED PURPOSE

REV. DEAR SIR,—AN answer in the I. E. RECORD (March, 1922), with reference to a Bishop's power to prescribe the application of the Mass for a specified purpose, does not take into consideration all the points which may be made in favour of the negative view. May I venture, therefore, a few remarks on that answer, and add a few points on which further light will be most welcome?

The *decision* of the Sacred Congregation of the Council refers to the power a certain Bishop possessed *by virtue of apostolic indult*: it does not refer, therefore, to the question under discussion. The present question is: Has the Bishop, apart from apostolic indult, power, on his own authority, to order the application of the Mass for a specified purpose?

The votes of the consultors in the case before the Sacred Congregation provide some foundation for the view that Bishops do

not possess that power. The consultor or consultors who favoured the negative view in the case before the Sacred Congregation, say : ' According to the present discipline only religious superiors prescribe for their subjects the intentions of their Masses. That is never done by Bishops, very rarely by the Pope who, without doubt, can do it, as he did it for the 29th June, 1918. Since Bishops cannot impose unusual obligations, they must be denied the faculty of prescribing the application of the Mass *pro populo*, and the bination Mass, in favour, for example, of the Seminary.' And that is the view of the consultors, even when the Bishop has already dispensed those parish priests, in virtue of apostolic indult, from the obligation of applying that Mass *pro populo* on suppressed feasts. Granted that dispensation, why cannot a Bishop, on his own authority, then order the application of that Mass for a specified intention ? The argument of those consultors seems to be : Bishops cannot impose obligations as to the application of any Mass ; therefore they cannot impose obligations as regards this particular Mass.

The vote of the consultor or consultors, who favoured the affirmative view in the case before the Sacred Congregation, provides foundation also for the view that Bishops have not, of their own authority, power to prescribe the application of a Mass. ' The Bishop, indeed, has not, on his own authority (*ex se*) the power to impose that obligation of application of Masses on parish priests and priests binating : therefore he sought an indult from the Holy See, which admittedly possesses the power he sought and obtained : having obtained the faculty, the power of the Bishop is evident. Therefore he obtained by such indult the power of prescribing the application.' These consultors take pains to show that it is by virtue of indult, and not by his own authority, that the Bishop prescribes the application of the Masses in question.

With regard to the argument advanced by the consultors that Bishops cannot impose unusual obligations, I leave the argument to canonists. The conclusions—that Bishops cannot, of their own authority, impose obligations as regards the application of the Mass—show that this is a question concerning which great men differ, and concerning which those consultors dissent from the views of Gasparri and Wernz.

The teaching of Gasparri on the point at issue calls for further comment. The approval by Gregory XVI of the Paris law is irrelevant. Diocesan laws do not require approval. And approval *in forma communi*, if given, would leave the laws just as it finds them. Laws that are invalid would not be validated by such approval. Besides the granting of liberal indulgences to the pious work does not constitute approval even *in forma communi*. As far as approval goes, we are left without formal approval. We have to depend therefore on the teaching of canonists and theologians.

There are some points made by theologians to which attention

may be directed with profit. Is the application of the Mass, with reference to its celebration, an internal act, which is only extrinsically and accidentally connected with the external act? The 'determinate intention for which a prayer is offered' is such an act according to Noldin (*De Legibus*, n. 138). The 'internal act directing the external act to a special purpose' is such an act, according to Bouquillon (*T. F.*, n. 114); and the application of the Mass is the very example he gives in illustration. Maroto (n. 185) says 'the intention of reciting the Rosary or hearing Mass for the conversion of sinners' is such an act. The 'intention of vainglory in almsgiving, and, in general, this or that intention that is extrinsic to the external work, and only added by the operator' constitutes such an act, according to the Salmanticenses (*De Legibus*, n. 70). 'An act is *per accidens* connected with another, when that other, without it, has its own form and substance, and can be considered a perfect human act in its own kind. Thus the act of almsgiving, or hearing Mass, is considered perfect, it is added *per accidens* that these acts be applied for the souls in Purgatory' (Ballerini, *De Legibus*, n. 123). Billot hints at the same distinction when he speaks of 'internal acts which are joined to an external act, as necessary for its validity, its goodness, or its moral essence.' The application of the Mass does not fall under any of these headings mentioned by Billot. It does seem to satisfy the definitions and descriptions by those various authors. It is therefore an internal act, which is only extrinsically and accidentally connected with the external act of celebration.

The next point to direct attention to, is that there is controversy among theologians as to the power of the Church to impose obligations with reference to purely internal acts. The very same arguments that go to show that the Church has not such power are equally valid when there is question of internal acts only accidentally connected with an external act. Noldin and the Salmanticenses expressly state so. We have Suarez, St. Thomas, St. Alphonsus, Salmanticenses, and a host of others denying the Church's power over purely internal acts. And we have the Salmanticenses and Sabetti denying the Church's power over those internal acts extrinsically connected with an external act. If we are left to the theologians we find it is a matter of controversy as to whether the Church possesses the power to prescribe the application of the Mass. From the use of such power on the 29th June, 1918, we must conclude that the Pope possesses that power; but it remains a matter of controversy whether or not a Bishop possesses such power as part of his ordinary authority. And it is not for any local council or diocesan synod to define questions of controversy not merely in matters of faith, but in all other matters that are controverted by theologians (Benedict XIV, l. 7, c. ii. n. 2; Bouix, *De Episcopo*, v. 6). Am I not free therefore to hold the view that diocesan synods, imposing obligations as to

the application of the Mass, acted *ultra vires*? Is there not sufficient weight of theology added to the votes of the consultors to render the view probable.

DUBIUS.

We welcome this very interesting contribution of 'Dubius' to the important question which we discussed in the March issue of the I. E. RECORD. Notwithstanding his very clear statement of his position and the formidable array of arguments by which he supports it we do not, however, see our way to modify in the slightest our former reply. A brief examination of the points which he makes will suffice to show that they do not really constitute any serious or insuperable objection to our views on this matter.

We willingly concede, as we did in the March issue, that the consultors on the negative side favour our correspondent's opinion. Although they were primarily concerned with two special kinds of Masses, their argument was universal in its application. It will not, however, bear close examination. As we pointed out in our previous reply, it rests on two assumptions: one of principle and the other of fact. The assumption of principle is that Bishops cannot impose unusual obligations. Now, the meaning of this principle is rather vague and indefinite, and, as this is its first appearance in the science of Canon Law, one naturally expects some explanation and proof of it from its author or authors. None, however, is forthcoming. It is self-evident that the principle is false, if it involves any denial of episcopal power in matters in which this power is explicitly or implicitly admitted. As a matter of fact, the nature of the episcopal office indicates, and it is the general teaching as well, that a Bishop may impose obligations, or in other words, make laws and give precepts in matters pertaining to the government of his diocese, unless in so far as his power is restricted by the laws or precepts of his superiors.¹ If the consultors' principle contradicts this teaching it is false; if it does not, it is valueless for their purpose.

The assumption of fact is that the obligation to apply Mass for a specified purpose is an unusual one in so far as its imposition by Bishops is concerned. In our reply we showed that this assumption, in the only sense in which it is of importance in the present discussion, is also false. We pointed out that modern canonists and theologians—we gave references to such great authorities as Wernz, Gasparri, and Lehmkühl—explicitly recognize the power of Bishops to impose obligations in this matter, and we drew attention to the fact that the power has been utilized at least in diocesan statutes in this country and in those of Paris, and that its exercise by the Archbishop of Paris received the approbation of Pope Gregory XVI. It only remains to add the fundamental reason for our position, viz., the fact that the application of Mass is a matter which naturally appertains to the spiritual government of a diocese,

¹ Cf. *Codex*, c. 335, § 1; Wernz, tom. ii. n. 756; Bargilliat, *Prael. Juris Can.*, vol. i. n. 579, ed. 25; Santi, *Prael. Juris Can.*, vol. i. p. 346.

and, therefore, also to the legislative competence of a Bishop ; and there has been no restriction on the part of any superior.

Enough has been said on this point : ' Dubius ' has made no attempt whatever to sustain the consultors' argument. His statement that he leaves the matter to the canonists shows that he relies merely on their authority. But surely it is scarcely necessary to point out to one who has discussed this matter with so much erudition that no man's opinion is worth more than the reasons upon which it is based, and that, if the latter are shown to be worthless, the conclusions derived from them are of the same character.

Moreover, if the views of these consultors are considered independently altogether of the reasons by which they are supported, it will be evident from a few considerations that the extrinsic probability attaching to them is very slight indeed. First of all, it must be remembered that these consultors were appointed to bring forward every possible argument on the negative side, that their office was similar to that of an advocate, and that consequently their statement is an *ex parte* one, rather than an impartial treatment of the whole case. In the next place, even though their argument has a much wider scope, yet they were primarily concerned with two kinds of Masses, in regard to the application of which a Bishop of himself has admittedly no power. Finally, it must not be forgotten that the decision of the Sacred Congregation was given against them.

With all respect to our correspondent's perspicacity we must differ with him, when he claims the authority of the consultors on the affirmative side for the general proposition that Bishops cannot of themselves prescribe the application of a Mass. Even a cursory examination of the quotation which he has given suffices to show that the consultors are dealing, not with episcopal power in general regarding the application of Masses, but only with this power in so far as bination Masses and the Masses of parish priests on suppressed holidays are concerned. They deny, indeed, that Bishops of themselves can prescribe the application of these Masses, and with perfect justice ; because general law has already legislated about them, and thereby withdrawn them from episcopal authority. It is quite unjustifiable, however, to draw a similar conclusion in regard to Masses about which general law has not legislated ; and the consultors have not done so.

' Dubius ' next criticises Gasparri's teaching regarding the approval of the Paris law by Gregory XVI. We quite agree with him that diocesan laws do not need papal approval, but clearly that fact would not prevent the Holy See from giving its approval in any particular case, if it so desired. We agree with him too, that the approval in the present case is not the same as the approval *in forma communi* usually given to the statutes of Provincial and Plenary Councils—by the way, this approval is regarded as adding something to the authority of these statutes ; nor is it an express approval at all. That it is an implicit approval, however, must, we think, be quite evident. In the theory of the consultors on the negative side, which our correspondent supports,

the Holy Father would have indulged a law which was invalid, and which consequently inflicted a serious injustice upon the clergy of the archdiocese of Paris—a thing which, it is needless to say, he would be acting wrongly in doing. For the lawfulness of Pope Gregory's act, therefore, the validity and justice of this law are requisite; and this is equivalent to saying that the Holy Father, by indulging this law, gave it implicitly his approval. Approval such as this is much more valuable than the approval *in forma communi* given to provincial and plenary statutes. In regard to this latter it is expressly taught that it does not necessarily vouch for the validity of each and every individual statute of the conciliar enactments to which it is given; whereas in the case of the former there is no express teaching, so that its value has to be determined from the particular circumstances. The implicit approval under consideration of its very nature, as we saw, requires the validity and justice of the law to which it was given; otherwise we are driven to admit that the Pope himself acted invalidly and unjustly.

The final point made by 'Dubius' is that the application of Mass is an internal act which is only extrinsically and accidentally connected with the external act of its celebration; and hence he deduces that it is at least doubtful whether it can be the subject-matter of episcopal legislation. The fundamental weakness of this argument is that it proves too much. If it is valid at all, it is quite as applicable to the Pope as to the Bishops. All those canonists and theologians who hold that a purely internal act, or an internal act only extrinsically and accidentally connected with an external one, cannot be the subject of law, include all ecclesiastical laws, papal as well as episcopal. Their great argument, too, is quite as applicable to the one class as to the other. Such acts, it is argued, cannot be the subject-matter of ecclesiastical legislative power because, from the very nature of things, they cannot be the subject-matter of ecclesiastical judicial power, and the legislative and judicial power are co-extensive. Now, a purely internal act and an internal act only extrinsically and accidentally connected with an external one are just as much excluded by the nature of things from the judicial power of the Pope as from that of a Bishop; they are just as little capable of proof in the tribunal of the former as in that of the latter. But there can be no doubt, now, as our correspondent himself admits, that the Pope may prescribe the application of Mass: the fact that he has done so on the 29th June, 1918, and also in the law requiring canons to offer the conventual Mass for benefactors, leaves no room for any other conclusion. We must conclude therefore, that there is some flaw in this objection of 'Dubius': either the application of Mass is intrinsically connected with its celebration, or else the opinion which holds that ecclesiastical legislators may prescribe internal acts which are merely extrinsically connected with external ones must now be regarded as certain. Personally, we think that the former supposition is the correct one. Without the intention of offering the Mass for some definite object, by far the most important part of its fruits, viz., the special fruits, remain unapplied. The application thus integrates the

celebration and constitutes, as it were, its complement ; and this seems to be quite enough to render the connexion between the two something more than a mere extrinsic and accidental one. The Mass, in regard to the application of its special fruits, is, therefore, on quite a different footing from other good works, such as prayer, almsgiving, etc.

It is in this way that Wernz and Gasparri explain their position, as can be seen from our quotations in the March issue. Lehmkuhl's explanation, which we omitted, is similar : ' Besides, it must be altogether denied that there is question here of a merely internal act ; but there is question rather of an internal act which is the complement of another mixed action, viz., the celebration of Mass which is completed by the application.' ¹

In the following quotation from Marc, the position is elaborated still further : ' It is certain that a human law, either civil or ecclesiastical, can command internal acts indirectly, if, namely, an internal act is of its nature and necessarily connected with an external one. It can be so connected in a threefold way : either *as the form* constituting the external act in its moral essence (*in esse suo morali*) : thus internal consent is required to contract marriage ; . . . or *as the cause* with the effect : and so he who forbids murder forbids also the will to commit it ; or *as the complement* necessary to perform an act correctly, as is the application of Mass, and the making of meditations during a retreat.' ²

Even if our correspondent's position were admitted—needless to say, we do not admit it—episcopal laws prescribing the application of Mass would still be quite valid and would impose an obligation in conscience. He holds that the Pope, indeed, has power to make such laws, but that it is probable that Bishops have not. In his theory, therefore, there is a doubt of law regarding the jurisdiction of the latter ; and in such circumstances, according to Canon 209, the Church supplies jurisdiction. The use of such jurisdiction would not necessarily be lawful, nor would it be decisive of the speculative controverted question ; but it would certainly be valid, and would render the laws made in virtue of it binding in conscience.

Our views on this question, therefore, are quite definite. We do not consider our correspondent's position tenable ; but even if it were, we should still think it incorrect to say that diocesan synods in imposing obligations as to the application of Mass act *ultra vires*. 'Dubius,' however, is clearly a man who is accustomed to weigh evidence himself, and possibly the arguments which have satisfied us may not make a like appeal to him. If he wishes to make any further comments on this question we should welcome them in some future issue of the I. E. RECORD.

¹ *Th. Mor.*, vol. ii. n. 206, ed. 10.

² *Inst. Mor.*, vol. i. n. 155, quaer. 2.

DOES ILLEGITIMACY PREVENT ADMISSION TO THE RELIGIOUS LIFE ?

REV. DEAR SIR,—1. Is there anything in the Code that would prohibit religious communities of women from receiving, as novices, those of illegitimate birth ?

2. Do you know of any religious communities that, in their Constitutions, make illegitimacy a reason for the rejection of applicants ?

3. If so, are these religious communities obliged to change their Constitutions in order to conform with the Code ?

4. If not, would a girl be justified in concealing from the superior the fact of her illegitimacy, when making application, especially if the fact is not known, and there is no danger of harm coming to the community by its revelation ?

5. In case the applicant herself does not know of her illegitimacy, is her Director justified in concealing the fact from the superior, at the time of her application, when he is convinced that there is no danger of its ever becoming known.

DUBIUS.

1. The answer to the first query is in the negative. Illegitimacy is not enumerated amongst the impediments for valid or lawful admission to the religious life contained in Canon 542, at least in so far as women are concerned.¹

2. We are quite certain that there are many such communities ; because in the *Normae*, published in 1901, upon which the Constitutions of new institutes were to be modelled, illegitimacy is one of the impediments.²

3. In our opinion, such communities are not obliged to modify a constitution of this kind as the result of the publication of the Code. The Code, in enumerating those who are prohibited from entering the religious life, does not state that all others have a right to admission, and hence a constitution such as the one in question would be *præter not contra legem*.³ Moreover, seeing that testimonial letters in accordance with Canon 545, § 4, must make reference, amongst other matters, to the legitimacy or otherwise of the aspirant to the religious life, it is evident that a constitution of this kind would be quite in harmony with the spirit of the Code.

4. In our opinion, the girl would not be justified in concealing her illegitimacy from the superior, if she desired to enter the community. Concealment would be a violation of an ecclesiastical law and also of the rights of the community, and for this no sufficient reason can be given. It may be alleged, indeed, that the revelation of the illegitimacy

¹ It is an impediment in institutes of men, in the case of those who are intended for the priesthood.

² § 61 : 'Illegitimi non rite legitimati.'

³ Canon 489 : 'Regulæ et constitutiones singularum religionum, canonibus hujus Codicis non contrariæ, vim suam servant ; quæ vero eisdem opponuntur, abrogatæ sunt.'

to the superior would result in the young lady's exclusion from the religious institute in question and also in her defamation. But the first is an effect essential to the law, and hence is not a valid excuse for not observing it, and the young lady can avoid defamation equally well by not seeking admission at all ; and, as she is *per se* excluded from being admitted, this alternative does not constitute any real grievance for her.

5. The Director is not, we think, bound to reveal the fact to the superior : in the hypothesis there is question only of a material violation of law and of a rather trivial infringement of the community's rights.

J. KINANE.

LITURGY

THE VEIL OF THE TABERNACLE

REV. DEAR SIR,—Will you kindly say, (1°) if it is necessary to put a curtain in front of the Tabernacle in which the Blessed Sacrament is kept ; or (2°) if the curtain just inside the door of the Tabernacle will suffice ? I have a beautiful front to the Tabernacle of the new altar which has been erected in my church, and if I could avoid putting a curtain in front of it I should be very glad. (3) Is there not some authority for holding that when the Tabernacle is richly ornamented the outward curtain may be dispensed with ?

SACERDOS.

The question of the veil or canopy of the Tabernacle of the Blessed Sacrament is a frequent subject of inquiry, and, under one aspect or another, has been dealt with more than once in these pages. The source of anxiety is doubtless the diversity of practice prevailing in different churches, and the difficulty or impossibility of fulfilling the law, if such exists, owing to the position and construction of many of our Tabernacles. The queries of 'Sacerdos' are typical of many we have received, and we shall try to answer them as fully as the space at our disposal will permit.

1°. Is it necessary to put a veil or curtain in front of the Tabernacle of the Blessed Sacrament ? Yes ; the Sacred Congregation has answered this question so frequently in the affirmative, and so emphatically, that we think there can hardly be any doubt about it. And not merely the front of the Tabernacle, but the whole of it should be covered by a veil ; the prescription of the Ritual, which, as we shall see, is confirmed by the decrees of the Sacred Congregation, being as follows : 'Hoc autem tabernaculum conopeo decenter opertum' (Tit. iv. cap. i. n. 6). The word *conopeum*, or canopy, is of Greek origin, signifying a tent-like covering, and in the context implies that a veil or covering should surround the Tabernacle after the manner of a tent. 'Conopeum,' says Van der Stappen,¹ 'est velum ad instar tentorii . . . superpositum Tabernaculo, ita tamen ut

¹ Vol. iv. p. 119 (Q. 154).

crux vel imago Christi emineat, a summa parte crispatum, amplum satis et undique dependens et Tabernaculum tegens, modo a fronte nonnihil ostiolum appareat . . . originem habet ex baldachino, vel potius ex cortinis, quae baldachinum et Altare tegebant, et quarum usus desiit cum coeptum fuit altaria muro seu parieti admoveere.' This covering, which may be of any suitable (*decenter*) material,¹ e.g., linen, silk, brocade, cloth of gold, etc., has both a practical and symbolical use. On the one hand it helps to preserve the Tabernacle free from dust and moisture, and on the other is intended to symbolize the tent of the Ark of the Old Testament and to suggest the reverence due to Our Lord in the Tabernacle, where He dwells as the prisoner of Love. This symbolism of the veil is important in the mind of Holy Church and accounts, to some extent at least, for the insistency of the Sacred Congregation on the fulfilment of the rubric of the Ritual in circumstances wherein the practical utility of the veil is not at all so apparent. The colour of the veil may be permanently white or cloth of gold, or it may vary² according to the colour appropriate to the Office of the day, provided that violet is used instead of black, e.g., on All Souls' Day or when a Requiem Mass is sung at the Altar. It may be well to note also that the veil is exclusively associated with the Blessed Sacrament and should, therefore, not remain on a Tabernacle from which the Blessed Sacrament has been permanently or temporarily removed—'ne populus in cultus actibus inducantur in errorem.'³

But the difficulty arises: How can the rubric of the Ritual be observed when the construction of the Tabernacle is such that it cannot be completely surrounded with a veil? Some of our Tabernacles are fixed up against the reredos or the wall of the church, others are buttressed by pillars on either side, and others are so peculiarly made that it is next to impossible to procure a veil that will not further emphasize their unshapeliness. Van der Stappen, discussing⁴ this difficulty in his own country, where, he says, the prescription of the Ritual is not generally observed, thinks it sufficient to excuse in many cases, but he adds: 'Pro multis tamen nostrorum Tabernaculorum hujus praescriptionis observantia possibilis est, et pro his desiderandum est ut usus Conopei, a Rituali Romano specialiter praescripti, introducatur.' We agree with him that such inconveniences may often excuse from the complete fulfilment of the rubric, but they cannot surely be said to avail against the partial fulfilment of it in the use of the veil, such as we know it, before the door of the Tabernacle. By the use of this veil we are complying with the rubric as far as is in our power—the symbolism of the veil is thus far maintained—and we think that the use of it in the circumstances is the least⁵ that is demanded by the prescription of the Ritual and the

¹ Decr. 3035 ad 10 (a).

² Decr. 3035 ad 10 (c).

³ De Amicis, vol. i. p. 27.

⁴ Vol. iv. p. 12.

⁵ 'Quando enim legem universam observare nequimus saltem ejusdem parti obtemperare debemus' (*Eph. Liturg.*, 1915, p. 662).

repeated declaration of the Sacred Congregation. The properly constructed Tabernacle should place no obstacle to a full compliance with the rubric, and, we might add, it ought to be the concern of the priest who purchases a new altar to make sure that it is so constructed.

We have seen it stated that a custom to the contrary should be held as sufficient to excuse, but such a custom, to have the force of law, would need the tacit assent of the legislator—'Quod consuetudo praevaleat contra legem Superioris id oritur ex ipsomet Superioris consensu qui etiam suae legi obviantem, cum rationabilis et diuturna sit, statuit tolerandam.'¹ Here, however, we have the law of the Ritual confirmed by numerous decrees of the Sacred Congregation and the oft-repeated declaration that a contrary custom is not even to be tolerated. We shall now quote a few samples of the replies of the Sacred Congregation on the matter.

(a) According to a decree² dated July 21, 1855, it was asked: 'Num Tabernaculum in qui reconditur S.S. Sacramentum, conopeo cooperiri debeat ut fert Rituale?' and the reply was: 'Affirmative.'

(b) Under date April 28, 1866, the following decree³ is given: 'Rñus D. Archiep. N., exponens, in ecclesiis suae archidioceseos usum ab antiquo tempore vigere, non cooperiendi conopaeo tabernaculum, in quo asservatur S.S. Eucharistiae sacramentum, sed intus tantum velo pulchriori serico, saepe etiam argento aut auro intexto, ornari; a S. Rituum Congregatione humillime petiit: Num talis usus tolerandus sit vel potius exigendum, ut conopaeum, ultra praedictum velum vel sine eo apponatur, juxta praescriptum in Rituali Romano? Sacra vero eadem Congregatio . . . respondendum censuit. Usum veli praedicti tolerari posse; sed tabernaculum tegendum est conopaeo, juxta praescriptum Ritualis Romani.'

(c) Again, on August 7, 1880, it was asked: 'Q. Utrum tabernaculum SS. Sacramenti, argento, auro, vel alia pretiosa materia confectum, eo ipso a generali obligatione illud tegendi conopaeo sit immune?' R. 'Servetur praescriptum Ritualis Romani.'

(d) Finally, in the year 1904, the Sacred Congregation declared⁵ that the custom of not using a canopy should not be continued: 'Q. Ab hodierno ceremoniarum magistro cujusdam ecclesiae Cathedralis expostulatum fuit: An servari possit consuetudo non habendi conopeum quo tegi debet tabernaculum, ubi asservatur SSñum Sacramentum?' R. 'Negative, et servetur Rituale Romanum et decreta.'

In face of these explicit statements of the competent authority we cannot see how any other reply than an affirmative one can be given to the first query of our correspondent.

2°. As may be observed in above decree (b) the use of this veil inside the door of the Tabernacle is tolerated, though not prescribed, but it is

¹ Ben. XIV, *De Synodo Dioc.*, 12, c. 8, n. 8.

² Decr. 3035, 10.

³ Decr. 3150.

⁴ Decr. 3520.

⁵ Decr. 4137.

no substitute for the proper veil of the Tabernacle, even though it were woven from threads of silver or gold.

3°. According to decree (c), the rubric of the Ritual is to be observed even when the Tabernacle itself is made of *gold*; it follows therefore that the veil should be used in all cases, no matter how precious the material of the Tabernacle or how beautiful and ornamental the door of it. Chalices and pyxes may also be of the most artistic designs, yet according to the rubrics they should be covered with a veil. The veil is a sign that the Blessed Sacrament is preserved in the Tabernacle; that sign and symbol is wanting if the veil is absent, no matter how precious the material of which the Tabernacle is constructed.

We are sorry if our reply is not such as to gladden the heart of our correspondent, though, surely, there will be some gratification in the fulfilment of the law. We should also like to remind him that our concern in these notes is to state the rubrical law as far as we know it—not to animadvert on what is done in one place or another.

THE DEVOTION OF THE 'FORTY HOURS,' BEGINNING ON PASSION SUNDAY. RESPONSORIES OF THE 1st NOCTURN DURING LENT

REV. DEAR SIR—Would you kindly reply to the following queries in the next issue of the I. E. RECORD :—

1. Is it permissible to start the 'Forty Hours' Adoration in a church on Passion Sunday, and if so, what Mass should be sung? Should the violet covering be removed from the crucifix, from the front of the altar, and from the pictures surrounding the altar on such an occasion?

2. If other Masses are said in the church during that and the following days, should there be a commemoration of the Blessed Sacrament? Might an Exequial Mass be said at a side altar during one of those days?

3. Does the rule that the Responsories of 1st Nocturn of an *Officium Ordinarium* should be taken from the Feria and not from the Common apply also to the Responsories of the 1st Nocturn during the Lenten season when there is no Scripture occurring. In other words, should the Responsories during Lent of the 1st Nocturn be the Ferial Responsories given after the three Homily Lessons or from the Common, like the Lessons themselves?

SUBSCRIBER.

1°. There is nothing in the rubrics to prevent the starting of the 'Forty Hours' Adoration on Passion Sunday. The only time exempted¹ is from Holy Thursday to the morning of Holy Saturday. The Mass, however, on that day should be the Mass of the Sunday, with a commemoration of the Blessed Sacrament under one conclusion with the

Prayer of the Mass. The following is the general rule regulating the Mass on the 1st and 3rd days of the Exposition: the Mass is the Votive Mass of the Blessed Sacrament with *Gloria, Credo*, and Preface of the Nativity, without any commemoration.¹ Within the Octave of Corpus Christi the Sequence is added in the Mass. The following, however, are exceptions to the rule: (a) Major Sundays of 1st and 2nd class (i.e., Sundays of Advent, and Sundays from Septuagesima to Low Sunday); (b) Feasts of 1st and 2nd class; (c) Ash Wednesday and the three privileged Feria of Holy Week (i.e., Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday); (d) Days within the privileged octaves of Epiphany, Easter, and Pentecost; (e) the Vigils of Christmas and Pentecost. On all these days the Mass of the day or Feast is sung with a commemoration of the Blessed Sacrament under one conclusion with the prayer of the Mass. It may be well also to note the following: (1) If the Feast is of the Passion of Our Lord, of the Cross, of the Holy Redeemer, of the Sacred Heart, or the Precious Blood, the commemoration of the Blessed Sacrament is omitted 'ob identitatem mysterii'; (2) if a Feast of the 1st or 2nd class occur on a Sunday the Prayer of the Feast with that of the Blessed Sacrament are sung under one conclusion and then, under a distinct conclusion, comes the Prayer of the Sunday, while the last Gospel is from the Sunday.

On Passion Sunday, therefore, the Mass for the 'Forty Hours' is of the Sunday (*sine Gloria, Præf. de dominica, color violaceus*) with a commemoration of the Blessed Sacrament under one conclusion with the Prayer of the Mass.

The colour appropriate to the Blessed Sacrament Exposed is white; hence during the actual Exposition the antependium, the veil of the Tabernacle, the stole, cope, humeral veil, and canopy (used in the Procession) should be white. It is usual to remove the crucifix during Exposition, but this is not prescribed.² Each church, according to the Sacred Congregation, is free to follow its own custom, and similarly the crucifix may or may not be restored for Mass celebrated at the altar of Exposition. If the crucifix is retained during the Exposition on Passion Sunday it should be covered with a white veil, and all pictures close to the altar should be covered with either a red or white hanging. On this day the vestments of the Mass, the antependium, the covering of the cross, the veil of Tabernacle (if it is not permanently white) are violet. At the end of Mass the antependium, the covering of the crucifix (if retained) and Tabernacle are changed to white. It will save time if the white covering has been placed beneath the violet before the beginning of the Mass. If the ministers do not leave the Sanctuary after the Mass the priest may lay aside the chasuble and maniple, and assume a violet cope, or the three ministers may exchange the violet vestments for white. The humeral veil is white in all cases.

On the second day of the 'Forty Hours' the Mass is said or sung at a side-altar and the colour of the vestments is regulated by the quality of the Mass. If the rubrics permit the Mass *Pro Pace*, and the

¹ Decr. 3574.

² Decr. 2365, 1.

Ordinary has not otherwise decided,¹ it should be sung with a commemoration of the Blessed Sacrament under one conclusion with the Prayer of the Mass. The colour appointed for this Mass is violet. The rubrics, however, exclude this Mass on the days (above mentioned) when the Votive Mass of the Blessed Sacrament is not allowed. On these occasions the Prayer *Pro Pace* is joined to the Prayer of the Mass under one conclusion, omitting all other commemorations.

2°. Private Masses at other altars during the days of the Exposition follow the calendar of the day, but a commemoration of the Blessed Sacrament is added after the Prayers prescribed by the rubrics. This commemoration, however, is not made on doubles of the 1st and 2nd class, nor on Palm Sunday, nor on the Vigils of Pentecost and Christmas.

Requiem Masses are prohibited in the church during the time of the Exposition, except the Mass on All Souls' Day, which should be said at a side-altar, and in violet vestments.² It should be noted, however, that during the 'Forty Hours' all the altars in the church are privileged,³ so that a plenary indulgence is obtainable through each Mass, provided it is offered for a departed soul.

3°. The Responsories of the 1st Nocturn are *de Tempore* whenever the Lessons are from the Scripture occurring.⁴ They are from the Common whenever the Lessons are from the Common. During Lent the Lessons of the 1st Nocturn of an ordinary Feast Office are from the Common, and so also are the Responsories.

M. EATON.

¹ The Ordinary may substitute for the Mass *Pro Pace* any other suitable Votive Mass. Cf. Decr. 3049, 4.

² Apostolic Const., August 10, 1915.

³ *Codex*, Can. 917, § 2.

⁴ Cf. Decr. S.R.C., October 28, 1913. Exception to the rule: Lessons of 1st Nocturn of days within privileged Octaves of the Universal Church are from Scripture occurring, but the Responsories are from the Octave.

DOCUMENTS

STATEMENT ISSUED BY THE CARDINAL PRIMATE AND THE ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS OF IRELAND ON THE PRESENT CONDITION OF THEIR COUNTRY

I

To every lover of our country the present condition of Ireland is a subject of deepest distress and humiliation. Wherever we turn our eyes, North or South, we see our dear country torn by unchristian feuds and factions that have brought us to the brink of ruin. Nothing but the good sense and solid virtue of the body of the people has saved us, thus far, from general anarchy and civil war. Unfortunately, the general public could, up to now, only look on with helpless anguish and shame while everything that was dear to them—social order, life, and property and national dignity—was being hacked to pieces by senseless military contentions and operations.

The great national question of the Treaty is a legitimate subject for national discussion and debate. On that big question every Irishman is entitled to his opinion, subject, of course, to truth and responsibility to God. Upon that important issue we, too, hold very definite and decided opinions, but we do not mean to obtrude them on anybody, founded though they are upon a disinterested and anxious love of Ireland's welfare. Like the great bulk of the nation, we think that the best and wisest course for Ireland is to accept the Treaty and make the most of the freedom it undoubtedly brings us for the first time in 700 years.

But we recognise that this is a national question to be settled by the national will, ascertained by an election carried out in the ordinary constitutional way. It is the nation as a whole and not any class or order in the nation that must decide it. Any other principle means national chaos, which no man who truly loves Ireland will risk for any motive whatsoever. And the cause of all our present scandals and turmoil is the unconstitutional policy of certain leaders, who think themselves entitled to force their views upon the nation, not by reason, but by firearms.

It is painful and sorrowful to us to have to use the language of condemnation; but principles are now being openly advocated and acted upon which are in fundamental conflict with the law of God, and which, as Bishops and Pastors appointed to safeguard Christian morals, we cannot allow to pass without solemn censure and reprobation.

Foremost amongst these principles is the claim that the army, or a part of it, can, without any authority from the nation as a whole, declare itself independent of all civil authority in the country. The army as a whole, and still more a part of the army, has no such moral right. Such

a claim is a claim to military despotism and is subversive of all civil liberty. It is an immoral usurpation and confiscation of the people's rights. More than any other order in society the army, from the very nature of its institution, is the servant and not the master of the nation's government, and revolt against the supreme authority set up by the people is nothing less than a sacrilege against national freedom.

As to the organ of supreme authority in this country at present, whatever speculative views may be entertained upon the subject, there can be in practice no doubt as long as the Dail and the Provisional Government act in unison, as they have hitherto done.

We beg the young men connected with this military revolt to consider religiously our solemn teaching on this fundamental maxim of social morality. Otherwise they will involve themselves and their followers in conscientious difficulties of the gravest character. For when in prosecution of these principles they proceed to make shameful war upon their own country they are parricides, and not patriots; when they shoot their brothers on the opposite side they are murderers; when they commandeer public or private property they are robbers and brigands, and are bound to restitution—all sins and crimes of most heinous guilt.

It pains us to the heart to think of our fine young boys, with their generous instincts, being mixed up in this network of scandalous and incalculable criminality. In God's name, we implore them to return to their innocent homes, rather than poison their lives and weight their consciences for eternity with such a grievous responsibility. If their political passion for an Irish Republic is wisely conceived, their day will come in God's good Providence.

We repeat that the legitimate and constitutional way to settle this question, the one road to peace and ultimately to an undivided Ireland, is to leave it to the decision of the nation, in a general election as ordered by the existing Government; and the sooner that election is held the better for Ireland and for all classes in it, for in the meantime, not only is life and property insecure and demoralisation spreading, but the economic security of the nation stands in imminent peril, with its concomitants of unemployment and hunger.

We can hardly believe it possible that the "Military Executive" are in earnest when they claim the right, if they like, to suppress the elections by force of arms to shoot their own brothers and fire upon their fathers and mothers when engaged in the exercise of their civil rights. What is this but to murder the free soul of Ireland? And what national crime more shameful and wicked and more calculated to disgust the world and make our very name a byword amongst the nations?

This whole system of military despotism is detestable. It is unbearable to our people, who already regard it with horror and disgust, and are beginning, because of it, to abhor the very name of men whom, but yesterday, they loved and gloried in. The impressive protest made against it by the Labour world on Monday last commands universal admiration. That protest of Labour is but the first rumblings of a general uprising of the nation against this attempt on the part of a few to trample in the dust our most sacred rights as Irishmen.

For the very life of the country is at stake by the operation of these fatal principles. It is for the people as a body to assert themselves and save Ireland, their own rights, their lives, their property, and their homes from wanton violation and destruction. They should make their voices heard from one end of Ireland to the other. Irishmen all over the world expect it of us that we will not allow freedom of speech, freedom of the Press, freedom of elections, freedom of civil life in all its branches, to be stifled by a few because they have guns in their hands, and foolishly think they are acting as champions of liberty when they are but digging freedom's grave.

We expect the priests, by kindly influence, to support the people in the assertion of their rights and to wean our young men, so dearly loved by us all, from evil tenets and evil ways.

Lastly, we appeal in the name of God, of Ireland, and of national dignity, to the leaders on both sides, civilian and military, to meet again, to remember old fellowship in danger and suffering, and if they cannot agree upon the main question, to agree upon two things at all events, and publish their agreement authoritatively to the world : that the use of revolvers must cease, and the elections, the national expression of self-determination, be allowed to be held free of all violence.

The man who fails to harken to this appeal, made not so much by us as by Ireland, will carry with him to the grave an odious and a dreadful responsibility.

II

Deep as is the anxiety caused by the general condition of the country, the feelings of the Bishops are especially harrowed by the terrible state of things prevailing in the North-East corner. Contrary to the best interests of the nation, to peace and progress, a section of the country has been partitioned off, apparently to give us a specimen of model government. If that government is to be judged by results, it must rank more nearly with the government of the Turk in his worst days than with anything to be found anywhere in a Christian State.

The condition of things in Belfast, especially, is such as must shock any man of Christian feeling or even the common instincts of humanity. Not only have Catholics been denied for over twenty months their natural right to earn their daily bread, and thrown on the charity of the world, but they are subjected to a savage persecution which is hardly paralleled by the bitterest sufferings of the Armenians. Every kind of persecution : arson, destruction of property, systematic terrorism, deliberate assassination, and indiscriminate murder reigns supreme. Catholics are shot down in the streets, in their homes or business premises, or wherever they come within reach of the fusillade which makes night hideous and every hour of day a terror ; hundreds of families have been burned out, and hundreds more compelled to abandon their homes or business houses, under threat of death ; and notwithstanding the agreements entered into, and many promises, nothing has been done to check this terrible reign of destruction and bloodshed.

The authorities can hardly plead helplessness. They have at their disposal tens of thousands of armed men paid for by the British Government; and still, while Catholics in the Six Counties cannot have even a shot-gun to protect their crops from the crows without prosecution, and even the threat of the lash, scarcely a single weapon of destruction, firearm or bomb has been seized from the emissaries of murder. On the contrary, almost every able-bodied Protestant in the Six Counties is supplied with arms to harrass his Catholic neighbours, with whom he had hitherto lived in peace and good neighbourhood. And they are making good use of this licence to persecute. Men cannot pass along the roads by day, and still less by night, without being held up, searched and subjected to ill-treatment. Even priests, who are often called out in the dead of night to assist the dying, are held up and searched and insulted. This shocks beyond expression the feelings of Catholics, who know that these priests are carrying the Blessed Sacrament. In a word, it would look as if there were a design, which is sometimes openly avowed by the wilder spirits, to exterminate Catholics from the Six Counties, especially from Belfast.

Attempts have been made to lay the blame for the horrible condition of Belfast upon Catholics and Sinn Feiners, but no reasonable man will believe that Catholics, who form only a fourth of the city's population, or Sinn Feiners, who form a much smaller percentage, are the instigators or originators of riots in which they are always the chief sufferers. Moreover, we cannot forget that, long before Sinn Fein was heard of, Belfast had gained a shameful notoriety for savage riots and the murder of Catholics in the name of religion. We need only recall the riots of 1864, 1872, and 1886.

III

As we are all in the hands of God, Who is never deaf to the cry of prayer and penance, we order as follows, until further notice:—

(1) That the Collect for Peace, *tamquam pro re gravi*, be said in all Masses when permitted by the rubrics; any other *orationes imperatae* are to be discontinued.

(2) That the Litany of the Blessed Virgin Mary be said after public and community Masses on Sundays and week-days, that God, through the intercession of His Immaculate Mother, may grant us spiritual and temporal peace.

(3) That the usual May devotions and the usual family Rosary be offered up for the same intention.

As it is good to join prayer with fasting, we invite all the faithful to join with the Bishops and Clergy in keeping the second Friday in May (12th May) as a Black Fast Day in atonement for our sins and as a day of united intercession for peace. We request that all our priests celebrate the Votive Mass for peace on that morning, and that the faithful, young and old, assist on that morning at the Peace Mass and receive Holy Communion for the same intention.

N.B.—The foregoing pronouncement is to be read at all Masses on Sunday, 7th May.

- ✠ MICHAEL, CARDINAL LOGUE, Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of All Ireland.
- ✠ EDWARD, Archbishop of Dublin, and Primate of Ireland.
- ✠ JOHN, Archbishop of Cashel.
- ✠ THOMAS, Archbishop of Tuam.
- ✠ PATRICK, Archbishop of Attalia.
- ✠ ABRAHAM, Bishop of Ossory.
- ✠ ROBERT, Bishop of Cloyne.
- ✠ JOSEPH, Bishop of Ardagh and Clonmacnoise.
- ✠ PATRICK, Bishop of Kildare.
- ✠ DENIS, Bishop of Ross.
- ✠ THOMAS, Bishop of Galway.
- ✠ MICHAEL, Bishop of Killaloe.
- ✠ LAWRENCE, Bishop of Meath.
- ✠ CHARLES, Bishop of Derry.
- ✠ PATRICK, Bishop of Clogher.
- ✠ PATRICK, Bishop of Kilmore.
- ✠ PATRICK, Bishop of Achonry.
- ✠ JAMES, Bishop of Killala.
- ✠ BERNARD, Bishop of Elphin.
- ✠ DANIEL, Bishop of Cork.
- ✠ JOSEPH, Bishop of Down and Connor.
- ✠ BERNARD, Bishop of Waterford.
- ✠ EDWARD, Bishop of Dromore.
- ✠ CHARLES, Bishop of Kerry.
- ✠ WILLIAM, Bishop of Ferns.
- ✠ DENIS, Bishop of Limerick.
- ✠ THOMAS, Bishop of Clonfert.

The following Bishops, who were unavoidably absent, sent authority to sign their names to the Bishops' pronouncement :—

His Grace Most Rev. Dr. BYRNE, Archbishop of Dublin.

His Lordship Most Rev. Dr. BROWNRIGG, Bishop of Ossory.

His Lordship Most Rev. Dr. COHALAN, Bishop of Cork

His Lordship Most Rev. Dr. KELLY, Bishop of Ross.

ST. PATRICK'S COLLEGE, MAYNOOTH,

April the 26th, 1922.

**EXTENSIVE FACULTIES FOR FIVE YEARS OBTAINABLE ON
APPLICATION TO THE HOLY SEE BY THE ORDINARIES
OF EUROPE (ITALY AND RUSSIA EXCEPTED)**

(March 17, 1922)

SACRA CONGREGATIO CONSISTORIALIS.

FORMULA II.

FACULTATES QUINQUENNALES PRO REV^{ms}. ORDINARIIS REGIONUM
EUROPAE, ITALIA ET RUSSIA EXCEPTIS.

Rev^{mi} Ordinarii locorum eo anno, quo Summo Pontifici '*Relatio dioecesana*' fieri debet ad normam can. 340 § 2—etiam in casu quo propter recenter adeptam possessionem dioecesis dispensatus Episcopus fuerit ab exhibenda *Relatione*,—possunt a respectivis SS. Congregationibus facultates quae sequuntur impetrare; salvis clausulis in rescriptis quoad usum facultatum adpositis.

Pro prima vice memoratas facultates impetrare poterunt etiam extra tempus praescriptum, duraturas tamen dumtaxat usque ad annum '*Relationis dioecesanae*' proxime futurum.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus S. Congregationis Consistorialis, die 17 Martii 1922.

✠ C. CARD. DE LAI Ep. Sab., *Secretarius*.

I.—*A S. Congregatione S. Officii.*

1°. Permittendi sacerdotibus et laicis ad tempus, et sub diversis clausulis pro casuum et circumstantiarum diversitate adiiiciendis, lectionem librorum prohibitorum, exceptis semper operibus de obscenis ex professo tractantibus.

2°. *Tantum pro regionibus ubi catholici acatholicis permixti vivunt, exceptis proinde Gallia, Hispania et Lusitania*:—Dispensandi in mixtis nuptiis super impedimento mixtae religionis vel disparitatis cultus cum clausulis, limitationibus et instructionibus pro casuum et locorum diversitate adiiiciendis.

II.—*A S. Congregatione de disciplina Sacramentorum.*

Excipiuntur ab indulto sequentium facultatum Helvetia, Gallia, Hispania, Lusitania et Belgium:

1°. Dispensandi *iusta et rationabili ex causa* super matrimonialibus impedimentis minoris gradus quae in Can. 1042 recensentur, nec non super impedimentis impredientibus de quibus in Can. 1058 ad effectum tantum matrimonium contrahendi.

2°. Dispensandi *ex gravi urgentique causa* quoties periculum sit in mora et matrimonium nequeat differri usque dum dispensatio a Sancta Sede obtineatur super impedimentis maioris gradus infra recensitis:

- a) consanguinitatis in secundo aut in tertio cum primo mixtis, dummodo nullum exinde scandalum aut admiratio exoriatur;
- b) consanguinitatis in secundo lineae collateralis gradu;

c) affinitatis in primo lineae collateralis gradu aequali vel mixto cum secundo ;

d) publicae honestatis in primo gradu, dummodo nullum subsit dubium quod coniux esse possit proles ab altero contrahentium genita.

3°. Dispensandi tempore et in actu Sacrae Pastoralis Visitationis aut Sacrarum Missionum, et non ultra, super omnibus matrimonialibus impedimentis supra memoratis cum iis qui in concubinato vivere reperiuntur.

4°. Sanandi in radice matrimonia nulliter contracta ob aliquod ex impedimentis minoris gradus si magnum adsit incommodum requirendi a parte ignara impedimenti renovationem consensus, dummodo tamen prior consensus perseveret et absit periculum divortii ; monita tamen parte conscia impedimenti de effectu huius sanationis et debita facta adnotatione in libro matrimoniorum.

III.—*A S. Congregatione Concilii.*

1°. Reducendi per quinquennium, ob diminutionem reddituum, perpetua missarum onera ad rationem eleemosynae in dioecesi legitime vigentis, quoties nemo sit qui de iure teneatur et utiliter cogi queat ad eleemosynae augmentum, et sub lege ut de missarum ita reductarum satisfactione a singulis celebrantibus Curia dioecesana quovis anno legitime doceatur.

2°. Transferendi per quinquennium intra fines dioecesis onera missarum in dies, ecclesias vel altaria alia a fundatione statuta, dummodo adsit vera necessitas nec divinus cultus idcirco minuatur aut populi commoditati praeiudicium inferatur, exceptis tamen legatis quae in certis locis adimpleri facile possunt per eleemosynae augmentum, et cauto ut de translatarum missarum satisfactione quovis anno Curia dioecesana a singulis celebrantibus legitime doceatur.

3°. Transferendi per quinquennium exuberantia missarum onera etiam extra dioecesim, cauto tamen ut quam maximus missarum numerus intra fines dioecesis celebretur atque adamussim servantur praescripta Codicis iuris canonici circa cautelas adhibendas in missis committendis.

IV.—*A S. Congregatione Religiosorum.*

1°. Facultas dispensandi super illegitimitate natalium ad ingrediendum in Religionem, quatenus a Constitutionibus Instituti requiratur, dummodo non agatur de prole sacrilego commercio orta, ad petitionem Superiorum, et dispensati ad munia maiora ne eligantur iuxta praescriptum Can. 504.

2°. Facultas permittendi celebrationem trium Missarum de ritu in nocte Nativitatis D. N. I. C. in ecclesiis religiosorum non comprehensis in Can. 821, § 3, cum facultate pro adstantibus ad S. Synaxim accedendi, ita tamen ut dictae tres Missae ab uno eodemque Sacerdote celebrentur.

3°. Facultas dispensandi super aetatis excessu pro admittendis ad habitum religiosum, quatenus a Constitutionibus Instituti requiratur, audita in singulis casibus Superiorissa Generali vel Provinciali atque praevio eorum consensu et respectivi Consilii, dummodo postulantes aetatem 40 annorum ne excesserint et polleant ceteris qualitatibus requisitis.

4°. Facultas dispensandi super defectu aetatis canonicae ad S. Ordinem Presbyteratus, non ultra . . . menses, etiam pro Religiosis exemptis, dummodo a suis Superioribus litteras dimissoriales acceperint et quatenus ordinandi ceteras qualitates habeant a SS. Canonibus requisitas et praesertim curriculum theologicum expleverint ad normam Canonis 976, 2 Codicis I. C.

5°. Facultas dispensandi super dotis defectu cum Monialibus et Sororibus in toto vel in parte, dummodo status oeconomicus Instituti detrimentum ne patiatur, et postulantes talibus sint praeditae qualitatibus, ut eas magnae utilitati Instituto fore certa spes habeatur.

6°. Facultas confirmandi Confessarium ad quartum et quintum triennium, dummodo maioris partis Religiosarum, convocatis etiam iis, quae in aliis negotiis ius non habent ferendi suffragium, consensus capitulariter ac per secreta suffragia praestandus, prius accedat, proviso pro dissentientibus, si quae ac velint.

7°. Facultas permittendi celebrationem SS. Missae Sacrificium Feria V in Coena Domini, facta licentia personis habitualiter in Communitate commorantibus sese reficiendi S. Synaxi, etiam ad adimplendum praecceptum paschale.

8°. Facultas permittendi Monialibus descensum in Ecclesiam, ut ipsae eam maiori sollertia mundare et decorare possint, exeuntibus prius ab Ecclesia extraneis omnibus, non exceptis ipsis Confessario et Monasterio inservientibus et extra Claustra degentibus, portae illius claudantur et claves Superiorissae tradantur, Moniales vero semper binae sint et porta per quam aditus interior ad Ecclesiam patet, duplici clavi claudatur, quarum una a Superiorissa, altera a Sanctimoniali ab Ordinario deputanda custodiatur et non aperiatur nisi in casibus enunciatis et cum praescriptis cautelis.

9°. Facultas permittendi Monialibus egressum e claustris urgente casu operationis chirurgicae subeundae, quamvis non secumferat periculum mortis imminantis aut gravissimi mali, per tempus stricte necessarium, praescriptis debitis cautelis.

V.—A *S. Congregatione Rituum.*

1°. Deputandi vicarium generalem vel alium sacerdotem in aliqua ecclesiastica dignitate constitutum ad altaria fixa et portatilia consecranda, servato ritu et forma Pontificalis romani.

2°. Deputandi sacerdotes, si fieri potest, in aliqua ecclesiastica dignitate constitutos ad altaria fixa et portatilia execrata consecranda, adhibita formula breviori *B* pro casibus Can. 1200 § 2. Cod. I. C. ; dum in casu Can. 1200 § 1, iam indulta fuit per ipsum canonem facultas et adhibenda est formula *A*.

3°. Deputandi vicarium generalem vel alium sacerdotem in aliqua ecclesiastica dignitate constitutum, ad consecrandos calices et patenas, servato ritu et forma Pontificalis Romani.

4°. Quando in Missa Hebdomadae Maioris dicitur *Passio*, pro sacerdotibus, qui binas Missas, ex speciali Indulto Apostolico obtinendo, celebrant, legendi in una Missa tantum ex *Passione* postremam partem

(*Altera autem die etc.*), praemissis *Munda cor meum, etc.*—*Sequentia sancti Evangelii secundum (Matthaeum).*

5°. Benedicendi obiecta pietatis, signo crucis (pro Episcopo seu Ordinario) servatis ritibus ab Ecclesia praescriptis. Occasione tamen visitationis pastoralis et quando multi petunt, et plura ac varia exhibent eiusmodi obiecta benedicenda, saepe etiam cum diversis formulis; hisce in casibus permittitur unica et brevis formula ab Episcopo seu Ordinario recitanda, dum fit signum crucis super obiecta; nempe: 'Benedicat haec omnia Deus Pater, Filius et Spiritus Sanctus. Amen.'

6°. Celebrandi Missam de Requite lectam semel in Hebdomada ab Episcopo seu Ordinario in proprio Oratorio.

VI.—*A S. Poenitentiaria.*

1°. Absolvendi quoscumque poenitentes (exceptis haereticis haeresim inter fideles e proposito disseminantibus) a quibusvis censuris et poenis ecclesiasticis ob haereses tam nemine audiente vel advertente quam coram aliis externatas incursis; postquam tamen poenitens magistros ex professo haereticalis doctrinae, si quos noverit, ac personas ecclesiasticas et religiosas, si quas hac in re complices habuerit prout de iure, denunciaverit; et quatenus ob iustas causas huiusmodi denunciatio ante absolutionem peragi nequeat, facta ab eo seria promissione denunciationem ipsam peragendi cum primum et quo meliori modo fieri poterit, et postquam in singulis casibus haereses coram absolvente secrete abiuraverit; iniuncta pro modo excessuum gravi poenitentia salutari cum frequentia sacramentorum, et obligatione se retractandi apud personas coram quibus haereses manifestavit, atque illata scandala reparandi.

2°. Absolvendi a censuris et poenis ecclesiasticis eos qui libros apostatarum haeticorum aut schismaticorum, apostasiam, haeresim aut schisma propugnantes, aliosve per Apostolicas Litteras nominatim prohibitos defenderint aut scienter sine debita licentia legerint vel retinuerint; iniuncta congrua poenitentia salutari ac firma obligatione supradictos libros, quantum fieri poterit, ante absolutionem, destruendi vel Ordinario aut confessario tradendi.

3°. Absolvendi a censuris eos qui impediverint directe vel indirecte exercitium iurisdictionis ecclesiasticae sive interni sive externi fori, ad hoc recurrentes ad quamlibet laicalem potestatem.

4°. Absolvendi a censuris et a poenis ecclesiasticis circa duellum statutis in casibus dumtaxat ad forum externum non deductis; iniuncta gravi poenitentia salutari, et aliis iniunctis, quae fuerint de iure iniungenda.

5°. Absolvendi a censuris et poenis ecclesiasticis eos qui nomen dederint sectae massonicae; aliisque eiusdem generis associationibus, quae contra Ecclesiam vel legitimas civiles potestates machinantur; ita tamen ut a respectiva secta vel associatione omnino se separent eamque abiurent denuncient, iuxta Can. 2336 § 2, personas ecclesiasticas et religiosas, si quas eidem adscriptas noverint; libros, manuscripta ac signa eandem transmittenda aut saltem, si iustae gravesque causae id postulent, destruenda; iniuncta pro modo culparum gravi poenitentia

salutari cum frequentatione sacramentalis confessione et obligatione illata scandala reparandi.

6°. Absolvendi a censuris et poenis ecclesiasticis eos qui clausuram Regularium utriusque sexus sine legitima licentia ingressi fuerint, necnon qui eos introduxerint vel admiserint; dummodo tamen id factum non fuerit ad finem utcumque graviter criminis, etiam effectu non secuto, nec ad externum forum deductum; congrua pro modo culpae poenitentia salutari iniuncta.

7°. Dispensandi ad petendum debitum coniugale cum transgressore voti castitatis perfecte et perpetuae, privatim post completum XVIII aetatis annum emissi, qui matrimonium cum dicto voto contraxerit, huiusmodi poenitentem monendo, ipsum ad idem votum servandum teneri tam extra licitum matrimonii usum quam si coniugi supervixerit.

8°. Dispensandi super occulto criminis impedimento, dummodo sit absque ulla machinatione, et agatur de matrimonio iam contracto; monitis putatis coniugibus de necessaria consensus secreta renovatione, ac iniuncta gravi et diuturna poenitentia salutari.

Item dispensandi super eodem occulto impedimento dummodo pariter sit absque ulla machinatione, etiam in matrimoniis contrahendis; iniuncta gravi et diuturna poenitentia salutari.

THE SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES ORDERS A NEW INVOCATION TO BE ADDED TO THE LITANY OF THE SAINTS

(March 22, 1922)

[This new invocation for the propagation of the Faith, which is ordered in view of the celebration of the third centenary of the Sacred Congregation de Propagande Fide, is to be inserted in the Litany after the invocation *Ut cuncto populo christiano*, etc. (*That Thou wouldst vouchsafe to grant peace and unity*, etc.). An approved translation of the new invocation is as follows: *That Thou wouldst vouchsafe to recall to the unity of the Church all those in error and lead all infidels to the Gospel light: We beseech Thee, hear us.*]

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

RESRIPTA AD AUGENDAM CELEBRITATEM SOLLEMNIUM TERTIO EXEUNTE
SAECULO AB INSTITUTA SACRA CONGREGATIONE DE PROPAGANDA FIDE
INDICTORUM

DE ADDITIONE OPPORTUNAE INVOCATIONIS LITANIIS SANCTORUM

Beatissimo Padre,

La Commissione per i festeggiamenti del terzo centenario della S. Congregazione di Propaganda, presieduta dall'Eŕmo Cardinale Prefetto della medesima, supplica instantemente la Santità Vostra perch  voglia

benignamente degnarsi di approvare la seguente invocazione e di dare ordine che venga inserita nelle Litanie dei Santi :

Ut omnes errantes ad unitatem Ecclesiae revocare, et infideles universos ad Evangelii lumen perducere digneris : Te rogamus, audi nos.

ROMANA

Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Pius Papa XI referente infrascripto Cardinali Sacrae Rituum Congregationi Praefecto, suprascriptam invocationem pro privata et publica recitatione, necnon pro additione Litanis Sanctorum post invocationem *Ut cuncto populo christiano*, etc., approbare et ad universam Ecclesiam extendere dignatus est. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque. Die 22 martii 1922.

✠ A. CARD. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,
S. R. C. Praefectus.

ALEXANDER VERDE, *Secretarius.*

L. ✠ S.

REVIEWS AND NOTES

THE CLERICAL STUDENT. By Rev. Michael Hickey, D.D., D.Ph. Dublin : The Kenny Press.

THIS book is a companion volume to *The Catholic Student*, written by the same author. The ten lectures comprising the book manifest a definite plan and cover most of the ground required by such a subject. It is clear that it was not meant to be exhaustive, and it is to be regretted that Dr. Hickey did not add some more lectures even at the cost of enlarging the book. He appeals to the young Levite at the outset to acquire high ideals for the development of character and for subsequent guidance in practical affairs. His long experience as a guide in the clerical spiritual life lends weight to his wise counsel, which is still more strengthened by Scriptural and Patristic authorities. The work from beginning to end is packed with quotations from the Old and New Testaments and from the Fathers. The author's manipulation of the Scriptures is decidedly original and shows exceptional genius in this department. His method suggests an appeal rather than a lecture, and this through the wealth of quotations rather than through his own words. No doubt, clerical students relish plenty of Scriptural authority, but over-packing tends to make the reader lose the grip of the subject. The author need not be so timid in driving home the full force of the arguments he has so ingeniously accumulated. More of his own homely wisdom and advice would be a welcome addition. One of the most beautiful of these admirable lectures is Number IX, in which he interprets and applies that portion of St. John's Gospel, beginning with the 13th and ending with the 17th chapter. It shows the author at his best, as a practical guide. He speaks from out a full and sincere heart, revealing intense conviction in every line. He speaks with sympathy and understanding of the cleric's difficulties, encouraging hope and strength rather than fear and dejection. This, combined with a simple and easy style, and a smooth, ready flow of language, cannot fail to impress the clerical student and inspire him with loftier ideals. In a word, Dr. Hickey is gentle and persuasive rather than peremptory and dictating, but he is none the less successful in attaining his meritorious object.

M. R.

THE JESUITS (1534-1921). By Thomas J. Campbell, S.J. One volume. 8vo. London : *Catholic Encyclopedia* Press. 1922.

THIS splendid volume of 937 pages is epoch-making as much for the amount of information it contains as for the novelty of the method adopted by the author in presenting the general history of the Order

to which he himself belongs. On the occasion of the General Assembly of the Order held at Loyola in 1892, Father P. Martin Garcia, the newly-elected General, called the attention of the delegates to the fact that no Jesuit had yet addressed himself to the task of writing the complete history of the Order. It was true that the Jesuits had already published collections of documents (*Monumenta historica Societatis Jesu*); a huge bibliography (Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus*); accounts of particular periods (i.e., Orlandini, Jouvancy, etc.), but so far no complete and adequate history of the Order had appeared from the pen of a Jesuit. This striking fact would go far to prove, if proof were needed, how reticent the Jesuits are to speak of themselves and to sound their own praises—contrary to the more commonly received opinion. Nevertheless, the lacuna was a matter for regret, as is abundantly evidenced by the magnificent work of Father Campbell. The first merit of this book is to open up the way, to outline for the first time in a single volume for the English and American public the fortunes and vicissitudes in the eventful and chequered history of the Company of Jesus from its foundation to the end of the Great War.

It is not, of course, an original work, that is to say it makes a generous use of works already published, a long list of which is given on pages xv and xvi. Its primary object is to popularize, but at the same time it is apologetic in a very forceful way. It contains much that is already matter of general knowledge; for example, the activity of the Jesuits in the domains of Theology, Ecclesiastical Sciences, and the Education of Youth, but if I am not mistaken, it will also be found to contain much that even well-informed Catholics will regard as new. Many facts already known appear here in a better light, many others that have been generally ignored or have been only vaguely known or misrepresented are here given in their true perspective, and will have for many the freshness of new discoveries. For instance, the Company of Jesus was originally founded, not to battle against the rising Protestant Reformation, but to convert the Turks. Then there is the gigantic work done by Blessed Canisius in Germany, the miracles and millions of converts by St. Francis Xavier and his companions in Japan, China, and India, and by other missionary Jesuits in different parts of the American Continent. The Jesuits were shamelessly robbed, routed, and suppressed by the Catholic Kings of Spain, Portugal, France, Austria, and Italy, but were received and welcomed with every mark of favour by the Protestant King of Prussia, Frederick II. Their Order was suppressed by the Pope, but was protected, fostered, and ultimately saved from extinction by the orthodox and *philosophe* Empress of Russia, Catherine II!

Although the history is written by a Jesuit, it is strictly impartial. Father Campbell does not refrain from mentioning the faults and failings of his brothers, nor does he believe that he is bound as a Jesuit to draw the cloak of charity over the stains which—in an exceptional way, it must be confessed—tarnish the glory of his Order. But neither could it be expected that such a history, because it has been written by a Jesuit, would remain indifferent when it has to record the intrigues, plots,

persecutions, calumnies, and absurd fables of which his Order was persistently and continuously the butt. It is an undeniable fact, though a sad one, that the narration of those things forms an essential part in the history of the Jesuits, and it is not the least merit of Father Campbell's work that he constantly mingles with his story the element of setting errors aright, of replying to attacks, and of flinging back—sometimes with a spice of malicious humour—the false arguments of ignorance and hatred.

On its own ground and in its own cause the chivalrous Order of St. Ignatius is within its right in being true to itself and in maintaining valiantly its glorious tradition, the merciless struggle in the vanguard against the powers of darkness for the salvation of souls and the greater glory of the Church Militant.

M. E.

BOOKS, Etc., RECEIVED.

America: A Catholic Review (April).

The Ecclesiastical Review (April). U.S.A.

The Rosary Magazine (April). Somerset, Ohio.

The Catholic World (April). New York.

The Austral Light (March). Melbourne.

The Ave Maria (April). Notre Dame, Indiana.

The Catholic Bulletin (April). Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.

The Irish Monthly (April). Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.

The Month (April). London: Longmans.

Études (April). Paris: 12 Rue Oudinot (VII^e).

Revue Pratique d'Apologétique (April). Paris: Beauchesne

The Fortnightly Review (April). St. Louis, Mo.

The Lamp (April). Garrison, N.Y.

Revue des Jeunes (April). Paris: 3 Rue de Luynes.

The Dublin Review (April-June). London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne.

Ṛéiltíní Óip. An t-Δε. Seóipre mac Cláim. Dublin: comluēt oroeācip na hÉipeann.

Meditations on the Passion. London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne.

A Nineteenth-Century Miracle. London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne.

De bello Gallico. leab. 2. corpmac ó caólaiz, m.ā., o'aircpiū. Dublin: Browne & Nolan, Ltd.

A Systematic Catechism. By Joseph Heald. London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne.

The Catechism Simply Explained. By H. Canon Cafferata. London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne.

Birth Control. By H. T. Sutherland, M.D. London: Harding & Moore.

The Credentials of Christianity. By M. J. Scott, S.J. London: Harding and Moore.

Medical Proof of the Miraculous. By E. Le Bec. London: Harding and Moore.

CATHOLIC LENDING LIBRARIES

BY REV. M. H. MACINERNEY, O.P.

THE late Provost Mahaffy is credited with the saying that Irish people read nothing but newspapers and novels. The dictum was obviously too sweeping, but it enshrined a regrettably large element of truth. He might have added that our people read English Sunday papers and betting journals, as well as certain imported novels and magazines, with little advantage to their morals or their pockets.

Anybody who has even a cursory acquaintance with English Sunday publications knows that, in very many cases, they are not fit reading for Catholic people. For instance, a recent issue of one of these sheets had two of its most prominent articles signed by two militant Atheists. One of the latest Sunday papers that I have seen regales its readers with stories of crimes and sexual infamy, served up hot and strong, under appetising headings, as if for the deliberate purpose of making vice attractive.

Most of these Sunday papers laid aside their customary foulness during the World-War, and devoted their columns mainly to episodes of the great conflict. Since the War, as most of us had foreseen, they have returned to their wallowing in the mire. They reek of the Divorce Court ; their interest is centred, to a most unwholesome degree, in the doings of libertines and criminals. Instead of occupying themselves with whatsoever things are pure and lovely and of good report, these papers prefer to deal with the basest aspects of human nature. Most of them, besides, were brutally anti-Irish during the whole period of the Terror ; which is another reason why they should be shunned by every self-respecting Irishman.

The Irish Vigilance Association made a gallant, and

largely successful, fight against these pernicious journals. But the turmoil of the last four years has crippled the Association's activities, with the result that the banned Sunday papers now circulate almost as freely as ever in this country. It is in vain that Bishop after Bishop has fulminated against these degraded and degrading journals; apathy and lack of practical organization among Catholics have left the evil undiminished. For years past the Lenten Regulations of Dublin have contained paragraphs like the following:—

There still are, unhappily, in this City and Diocese, as elsewhere, persons calling themselves Catholics, who take part in the sinful traffic in publications of a debasing, seductive, or otherwise irreligious character, and thus lend themselves to the diabolical work of undermining the morals and the faith of our Catholic people, doing this for the sake of worldly gain, without heed to the warning words of Our Lord: 'What doth it profit a man to gain the whole world if he suffer the loss of his soul?' (St. Matt. xvi. 26).

Those engaged in this debasing and sinful traffic, so long as they persevere in their evil courses, are unworthy to be admitted to the Sacraments. It is to be hoped that the public authority will adopt efficient means to protect the youth of our country from being contaminated by such vile publications.

These admonitions would run no risk of remaining a dead letter if the Vigilance Association were actively supported by many of us, clergy and layfolk alike, who could take a practical part in the work of the Association oftener than we do. Occasional sermons in commendation of Catholic literature, and in disapproval of that which is salacious and vile, would do much to awaken the conscience of our people, and to form a sturdy, healthy, public opinion. If the principle that the sellers of evil publications 'are unworthy to be admitted to the Sacraments,' were properly driven home to the minds of our Catholic people, it would produce a most salutary effect upon the purchasers as well as the vendors of such publications. Small but energetic branches of the Vigilance Association might easily be founded, or revived, in our cities and towns. They could do much to curb the sale of objectionable periodicals,

as well as to form a sound public opinion in regard to this highly important question.

Governments cannot afford to legislate in advance of public opinion. If we had a vigorous public opinion on the subject of evil literature, it would be easy for a patriotic Government to take drastic steps against the importation of noxious Sunday papers and other publications of a demoralizing tendency. Several years ago the New Zealand Government placed the novels of a notorious English authoress under the ban, and instructed the Customs officials to bar their importation into the country. It would be an excellent thing if the Irish Government could see its way to place a good many of the English Sunday papers, as well as certain foreign novels and magazines, under a similar ban.

Some time ago, in Galway, I came across an English or Anglo-American magazine, whose one object seemed to be the glorification of adultery. The friend in whose house I found that precious production was himself a hardened reader of magazines; but he confessed that some of them had become so improper that he had given them up in disgust. A few years ago I was asked to read an exceedingly grimy novel, which somebody had borrowed from one of our Municipal Libraries. It had evidently been a long time in use, and had passed through many hands which were none too clean. It was the work of an English author; and it proved to be, both morally and materially, one of the filthiest books I had ever seen. A couple of weeks ago I picked up a gaudy French novel at one of the bookstalls on the quays. The title seemed equivocal, though possibly innocent; but on dipping into the book, I found it to be a perfectly shameless piece of pornography. I hoped that the language might deter people from buying it; but, on passing that way a few days later, I found that the book had been snapped up, while many less harmful books lay there unpurchased.

Betting papers cumber the counters of small news-agents in the back streets of Dublin; and our evening

papers publish midday editions, mainly in the interests of the racing and betting fraternity and their customers. This evil goes on unchecked, despite the annually repeated warning of the Archbishop of Dublin :—

The ruinous practices of betting and gambling, in its various forms, which have so rapidly gained ground in our midst, still continue, in spite of every warning, to strengthen their hold upon vast numbers of our people, even amongst the comparatively poor and the young.

As if to emphasize the timeliness of the Archbishop of Dublin's warning, the London correspondent of an Irish journal announces, under the caption of 'Casinos for Ireland' :—

I hear of a scheme which is assuming shape on this side for the establishment of a gaming Casino in Ireland on the lines of the Monte Carlo institution. I am told, indeed, that there are two of these schemes. It is contemplated that one of the Casinos—perhaps there may be only one such project—should be set up not very far from Dublin.

The idea is to 'make the foreigner pay'—in other words, that people should be attracted to Ireland to stake their money, and thus not only enrich the promoters of the Casino, but put money in the purse of the Irish Government. The inception of the scheme or schemes would, of course, be dependent on permission being forthcoming from the Government of the Irish Free State.¹

We may hope that the Irish Government will sternly refuse to sanction any such project. The experience of Lisbon ought to suffice for an example and a warning. Within the last twenty years Lisbon and its environs have suffered from a plague of casinos. Many of these were palatial establishments, possessing a three-fold attraction as gambling hells, high-class restaurants, and stylish houses of ill-fame. The results were appalling. These casinos led to so many suicides and so many defalcations from commercial firms; they caused the ruin of so many young men, and brought dishonour upon so many respectable families; they gave such a tremendous impetus to extravagance and immorality; their managers were so often proved guilty of trickery and fraud, that they were summarily closed down, just two years ago, by a none too squeamish Republican Government.

¹ *Irish Independent*, March, 1922.

It is remarkable that the pleas advanced on behalf of the casinos of Lisbon were exactly similar to those which are now put forward for the establishment of gambling hells in Ireland. Lisbon was to become the Monte Carlo of the West. Foreigners were to flock from every land to the casinos of Lisbon, like docile pigeons, ready for plucking. The foreign tourist traffic was to become an immense and most profitable enterprise, to the lasting benefit of the public treasury and of the private pockets of the citizens.

All these pleas proved fallacious in themselves, as well as ruinous to thousands of citizens. Few foreigners came to the casinos of Lisbon, except the financial sharks who started and managed them. It was no longer a question of 'making the foreigner pay'; it was simply a case of 'letting the foreigner prey' on the gilded youth of Lisbon. This the native and foreign sharks proceeded to do, until they debauched and demoralized the young men of Lisbon, and bled them white into the bargain. The newspapers rang with denunciations of the casinos, and public indignation waxed so strong against those gilded halls of vice and ruin, that the Government at length took its courage in both hands, and abruptly closed every casino in Lisbon and its vicinity.

The urgency of the subject must be my excuse for this digression. At present our people read far too many betting papers, and we are faced with an alarming and formidable extension of the gambling evil. Our people also read far too many of the imported Sunday papers, as well as certain novels and magazines, which are pernicious to their morals. These evils can be overcome, it seems to me, partly by vigorous and widespread agitation on the part of Catholics, and partly by enlightened and patriotic action on the part of the Government.

We have been dealing, so far, with the negative side of the question. The positive side now claims our attention. A merely negative policy, a policy of mere prohibition, is foredoomed to failure. People cannot live in a literary and social vacuum. We must eagerly supply good literature

in place of that which is evil. We must replace the literary *fleurs du mal* by the literary *fleurs du bien*. We must prevent the turbid flood of foul literature from inundating our country; and we must substitute for it a limpid flood of pure and inspiring Catholic literature.

Whatever else our Catholic people may read at present, there is one species of literature which they assuredly do not read, to any adequate extent, and that is Catholic literature. They support the *Irish Messenger* and its allied publications, as well as the *Irish Rosary* and the *Imeldist*, in a very praiseworthy fashion; and, within the last year or two, they have begun to take a lively interest in the publications of the Catholic Truth Society of Ireland. All this is quite as it should be. But these varied publications, after all, are but a small corner in the vast field of Catholic literature.

We have a splendid Catholic literature in English, and a growing Catholic literature in Gaelic. Neither branch is supported nor valued as it deserves. If we look carefully through the lists of Catholic books published by various firms in Ireland, England, and America, we shall be surprised at the wealth and variety of the Catholic literature that exists in the English tongue, and saddened by the reflection that the great bulk of this literature is almost unknown in Ireland. Few, indeed, of our lending libraries can show a decent assortment of the Catholic books published by Browne and Nolan, Duffy, Gill, Burns and Oates, Sands, Longmans, Herder, Benziger, Kenedy, Sadlier, and other firms. Admirable Catholic reviews and magazines, such as *Studies*, the *Dublin Review*, the *Month*, the *Irish Monthly*, *Blackfriars*, the *Catholic World*, *America*, the *Ave Maria*, the *Magnificat*, etc., should be regularly taken in our lending libraries, where their absence is painfully conspicuous at present. If we look at the Catholic second-hand books offered for sale by Baker of London and Woodhouse of Birmingham, we shall speedily realize how few of these works ever find their way into our lending libraries in this country. How many of these libraries can show a

fair selection of the works of Canon Sheehan, Cardinals Newman, Wiseman, and Manning, Mgr. Benson, W. S. Lilly, Hilaire Belloc, and so on? How many have even a good selection of Catholic novels?

The *Catholic Who's Who* furnishes another test. If we turn over the pages of that vivacious annual, we shall find the names of scores of living Catholic writers, with lists of their publications duly set forth. Allowing for the fact that some of their writings, for one reason or another, may be unsuitable for a lending library, it still remains true, if I am not grossly mistaken, that 95 per cent of these writers and their books are ignored by the Irish reading public. In the domain of Gaelic literature, our record is scarcely more creditable. *Gadelica* and the *Branar* were substantially Catholic in tone, if not distinctively so, yet we allowed them to perish of inanition; and our patronage of the *Stíoladóir* is very far from satisfactory.

Our people are unwilling to buy books; a recent writer complains that Ireland is the worst book-buying country in the civilized world. Catholic publishers and booksellers lament, with tragic unanimity, that 'Irish people are not a reading people.' As a rule, however, Irish people will borrow books readily enough, though they may not purchase them. Herein lies a golden opportunity for the circulating libraries, as the secular lending libraries have long since discovered. If our Catholic lending libraries were enterprising and progressive, they could render invaluable service to the cause of Catholic literature. Until our lending libraries are re-organized and developed, on thoroughly progressive lines, the outlook for Catholic literature—and for Gaelic literature—will be drab in the extreme.

Yet the Irish Bishops have been urging the claims of good literature for more years than any of us can remember. We pay lip-homage to the pastorals, in which clergy and laity alike are urged to do their best for the circulation of good literature; and next day, or it may be next hour, we let the subject slip from our minds and fade into oblivion. The present plight of Catholic literature in Ireland is mainly

due to the fact that we have no effective machinery either for its popularization or for its distribution. We need to create a widespread, popular demand for Catholic literature ; and simultaneously, we need to secure a prompt and generous supply of Catholic books and magazines, to meet the demand thus created. In other words, it is mainly a matter of organization and propaganda, on behalf of a most excellent cause.

In the poverty-stricken times of sixty or seventy years ago, a serious effort was made, at least in some quarters, to bring Catholic literature, meagre as it then was, within reach of our people. For instance, the *Irish Catholic Registry* of 1857 reports that, in the diocese of Derry, under Dr. Kelly, 'Circulating Libraries in the respective parishes [are] in vigorous operation.' If a Catholic lending library were 'in vigorous operation' in every parish throughout Ireland to-day, our people would be incomparably better acquainted with Catholic literature than they are, and the twin causes of faith and morals would be immensely the gainers.

In 1866 the same *Registry* (which was beginning to change its name to *Directory*) reports that 'there is a Library in almost every parish in the diocese' of Ossory. Besides, 'there are 80 Public Catholic Circulating Libraries in the diocese [of Ferns]. About ten years back, Mr. Richard Devereux gave a present of 123 volumes to every parish in the diocese, or about 4,920 volumes. In Wexford, the Young Men's Society have added 564 volumes to those given by Mr. Devereux, making a total of 687.' In like manner, 'there are Circulating Libraries attached to each Convent School' in the diocese of Kerry, which could pride itself on the possession of 14 or 15 convent schools at that period.

From time to time one meets with well-thumbed old volumes which had belonged, in the sixties or seventies, to Catholic lending libraries, which are now extinct. If so many Catholic libraries could be established, ten or twenty years after the Great Famine, when the majority of our people were poor, struggling, and dispirited, surely it ought to be vastly easier to establish or improve such libraries

to-day? Irish Catholics are more prosperous now than they have been for centuries past; and Catholic literature has grown mightily in variety and value within the last sixty or seventy years. It has also grown very largely in price since 1914—and this is a crucial disadvantage.

Some forty years ago, Canon Gately propounded his 'automatic' scheme for the working of parish libraries. The idea was extremely simple and ingenious. The subscribers were grouped into circles. Each circle consisted of twelve members, and was designated by a letter of the alphabet; thus the fourth circle would be known as Circle D. Twelve books, carefully selected, and assorted with equal care, so as to provide the greatest variety of reading matter, would be allotted to the use of each circle. These books were marked D1, or D2, and so on, up to D12.

At the outset of the lending year, the first subscriber received D1, the second D2, and so on. Each subscriber was bound to return his volume punctually at the close of a month; he enjoyed the use of the twelve volumes in rotation during the year. He also knew the order in which he was to receive the volumes. If he had D6 this month, he would be entitled to D7 next month, D8 the month after, and so on. The annual fee was only a shilling. When the year ended, the twelve volumes, now somewhat damaged by constant use, were distributed by lot amongst the members of Circle D, and became their private property. A similar procedure was followed in all the other circles. The scheme was successfully worked by Canon Gately himself in various places, with the assistance of teachers in rural schools. After twenty years' continuous trial of this 'automatic system,' he declared that he had always found it 'cheap, easy, and effectual.'

Canon Gately's scheme earned the cordial approval of leading prelates at home and abroad. Cardinal Logue described it as

a very promising attempt to solve a difficulty which we have all experienced—that of finding the means of putting good, sound, wholesome reading within easy reach of our young people. Priests who have tried

Parochial Lending Libraries give a very discouraging report of their experiences. . . . One thing is certain : if we wish to save our people, particularly our young people, from the contaminating influence of bad reading, this can be most effectually done by supplying them with useful and wholesome literature. The end is one for which we must strain every nerve. Whether it be carried out by one means, such as your scheme, it matters little, provided it be secured.

Archbishop Walsh wrote :—

It seems an admirable plan, and I am not at all surprised to hear that it works well. . . . Your plan of allowing the definite period of a month for the use of a book in each case, seems to me to give almost absolute security of regularity of working. Every member of a 'circle' knows at once of any irregularity that affects him. Under such a check, irregularity seems bound to disappear.

The Gately scheme was explained by its author, in a little book, published in 1894, and republished in 1901, under the title of *The Automatic Circulating Library* (Dublin : Browne and Nolan). The volume is now almost out of print. Of the fate and fortunes of the scheme in the last twenty years, I know nothing. On the whole, it would seem that Canon Gately's system is best suited for rural districts, where a book is read, in leisurely fashion, by several members of a family, and where the system itself can easily be worked by teachers in the primary schools.

Nearly twenty-two years ago, at the National Synod of Maynooth, the Irish Hierarchy uttered wise and weighty words on the perennial subject of books and reading. Indeed, the Maynooth decrees on this topic are models of enlightened legislation. Far from confining themselves to merely prohibitive measures, the heads of the Irish Church showed a keen and practical zeal for the encouragement of Catholic literature. For the convenience of non-clerical readers, I may give a rough version of these decrees :—

28. Devotional pamphlets and booklets in defence of the Catholic Faith should be circulated as widely as possible. We deem it right to remind parish priests and curates that well-managed parochial libraries are of great utility to the faithful. Hence, we direct that such libraries be established in all parishes, on the 'Automatic Parochial Circulating Library system,' or any similar plan. Where such libraries already exist, they are to be fostered and developed with the utmost diligence.

29. Where public libraries are set up by the civic authorities, it is most desirable that some prudent priests, well versed in literature, should become members of the Library Committee, and use their influence for the exclusion of dangerous books.

30. We heartily commend the excellent Catholic Truth Society of Ireland, which exists for the defence and exposition of the Catholic Faith ; and we urge the clergy to give effective help to that Society, by joining its ranks and circulating its publications.

31. The Bishops must select a number of learned and skilful priests, who shall examine all books that are regularly or occasionally used in colleges, seminaries, and primary schools, so that, when occasion arises, objectionable books may be wholly excluded or else re-issued in a harmless form.

435. With a view of reducing the dangers of the system of National Education to a minimum, we deem it well to decree :—

1°. That books which contain anything noxious, against the canon of Sacred Scripture or the inspiration, integrity, or veracity of Holy Writ, and books which contain anything whatsoever contrary to faith or morals, must on no account be tolerated in the schools.

2°. That no book which treats of religion or morals shall be admitted, unless it is at least tolerated by the Ordinary, whose function it is to pronounce with authority on questions of faith and morals. . . .

460. Books for the use of pupils in convent schools are to be selected with care ; and it is highly important that the girls should be taught to use such books as aids to their serious studies.

501. Amongst the countless evils that have sprung up in this age, there is scarcely any more deplorable, or one that has inflicted more injury on the faith and morals of Christians, than ‘ that foulest plague ’ of books and pamphlets scattered on every side, and leading to sin. Artfully composed, full of fallacy and ingenuity, and circulated in all places, at immense expense, for the ruin of Christian people, they disseminate pestiferous doctrines everywhere, and deprave the minds and souls, especially of the unwary (Pius IX, Ency. *Qui Pluribus*).

502. Nor can it in the least be pretended that this sad condition of things does not exist in our own Ireland, although it be to a smaller extent than in certain other countries.

503. For everywhere there are offered for sale, and circulated at a low price, books, pamphlets, and novels, as well as periodicals, the writers of which either openly or insidiously attack, and endeavour to overthrow, religion and good morals. These publications are sometimes purchased and taken home by Catholics, who allow them to be read indiscriminately by their children and servants.

504. Whereas it is our office to lead our flocks to salutary pastures, and to turn them away from what is poisoned, we vehemently exhort in the Lord all priests, but especially those having the care of souls, and in the bowels of the Lord we beseech them, that, moved by the zeal of God, they turn the faithful away, both publicly and privately, from all these perverse publications.

505. And as parents and others exercising authority, who keep their children and domestics aloof from this pestilent stuff, deserve the greatest praise ; so, on the other hand, those must be sharply reprov'd who neglect this duty—which binds them both by natural and divine law, and for which they shall render a most strict account to the Supreme Judge—and have no concern for their household, forgetful of the words of the Apostle to Timothy : ‘ If any man have not care of his own, and especially of those of his house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel ’ (1 Tim. v. 8).

506. As for those who apply themselves to the work of diffusing the aforesaid perverse books and periodicals, more especially such as contaminate purity of mind (as a rule these vicious publications are imported from foreign countries), let pastors admonish such persons how disgraceful it is for them to profit by the loss of faith and morals, and to increase their wealth by the ruin of souls ; so that at length they may learn to fear the judgments pronounced by Jesus Christ, our Redeemer, against those through whom scandal cometh.

507. It is highly desirable that persons who are gifted with talent, and apply themselves to literature (following in the footsteps of those who acquired conspicuous merit for themselves by composing books in a truly Catholic spirit), should write books, especially for that most useful agency, the Catholic Truth Society of Ireland, so that piety may be fostered, and minds entertained as well as instructed. It will be the duty of pastors to recommend the writings of such authors to their people, and to see that their books are placed in the parish libraries.

508. It is also very desirable that a special Committee, in connexion with the meritorious Catholic Truth Society just mentioned, should compile a catalogue of good books and re-issue it from time to time, so that booksellers in country towns may be able to supply their customers with a large and varied selection of books which are nowise harmful to faith and morals. It would be the duty of priests to place these catalogues in the hands of booksellers, and to warn them against selling any other books, unless they know them to be quite harmless. The catalogues issued by St. Anselm's Society in England might be adopted as a beginning ; and new books could be added to the list, three or four times a year.

509. But we command that books professedly treating of religion, and all pamphlets or leaflets which contain formulas of prayers, be not printed or offered for sale by Catholics without the licence of the Bishop. Caution must also be used concerning books nominally Catholic and written for entertainment, lest they contain anything contrary to faith or good morals.

These fifteen decrees embody an admirable and truly statesmanlike programme. If this programme were carried out with energy and zeal throughout the country, it would make the fortune of Catholic literature in Ireland. It

would give a colossal impetus to the circulation of Catholic books, pamphlets, and magazines, while imposing a rigid boycott on all forms of evil literature, with the possible exception of English Sunday papers and minor publications, which local Vigilance Committees might be trusted to keep in check.

It would be interesting to know exactly how far these decrees have been observed. In how many Irish districts may we find well-appointed parish libraries? What supervision is exercised over the books read by young people in our schools and colleges? Apart from the activities, more or less sporadic, of Vigilance Committees in Dublin and Limerick, where has a determined and persevering effort been made to prevent the circulation of foul Sunday papers and objectionable novels and magazines? What steps have been taken to form a Committee, under the ægis of the C.T.S.I., for the compilation of catalogues of good books? And what pressure has been brought to bear on booksellers, that they may keep a large and varied assortment of good books in stock, and refrain from selling evil publications?

Some progress, at all events, must be registered. The C.T.S.I. is now a far more flourishing concern than it was in 1900. Last year it published a fairly comprehensive list of books, mostly by Catholic writers or Catholic in tone; and the Society will furnish any of these volumes to lending libraries or private purchasers on favourable terms. Father Stephen J. Brown, S.J., has compiled an exceedingly useful list of 'Irish Storybooks for Boys and Girls' (*Irish Messenger* Office, Dublin, price 2*d.*), which should likewise prove a boon to all who are interested in lending libraries. Father Brown is also identified with a stately project for the formation of a first-class Catholic Reference Library (if I am right in so describing it) in Westmoreland Street, Dublin, and the scheme seems to deserve the cordial good-will and co-operation of educated Catholics.

The most successful Catholic lending library I have ever seen was at North Adelaide, an aristocratic suburb of South Australia's capital. This library was founded in

a small way with thirty or forty books and some two dozen magazines, by a holy Dominican nun of Irish descent, who has since gone to her reward. The entrance fee was half-a-crown; for a penny a week each subscriber had the use of one book and one magazine. The library grew by degrees, until it contained over 1,000 volumes, and scores of magazines. In its books and magazines alike it was a genuinely Catholic library.

On Sunday afternoons, two or three nuns attended to the subscribers, and kept an account of all books lent and returned. The library, open for two hours every Sunday afternoon, attracted young people from North Adelaide and all the neighbouring parishes. You might have seen dozens of young people, principally girls, walking leisurely homewards, laden with books from the library, for themselves and their relatives and friends. One result was that the Catholics of that region were kept admirably in touch with all that was best and most recent in Catholic literature, whether Irish, English, or American. In the matter of journalism, Australian Catholics, unlike our people at home, are well posted in Catholic news and views, thanks to their weekly papers, which are big budgets of Catholic articles and items, culled from European and American exchanges.

Another result, or symptom, of the good work done by the North Adelaide lending library was this: There was in my district an old Irish Protestant from Tipperary, married to a Catholic wife. His children were Catholics and subscribers to the library; they generally borrowed a couple of books every Sunday. Through reading these books, the old man shed his prejudices, one by one. When I met him, his difficulties in regard to the Catholic Faith were reduced to two, which I succeeded in removing. I found him so well instructed in Catholic doctrine, thanks to his assiduous reading of books from the library, that there was no need of a formal course of instruction. I received him into the Church, and he became one of the most fervent converts I have ever known.

Now, if the nuns in North Adelaide could conduct a

Catholic lending library so successfully, surely the nuns in hundreds of Irish convents could do the same. And surely the Christian Brothers, the Presentation Brothers, the Patrician Brothers, and the Franciscan Brothers could take a meritorious part in the good work, by making their lending libraries really Catholic and up-to-date, and by throwing them open to the general public. I often think that the future of Catholic literature—and of Gaelic literature—in Ireland rests with the nuns and Brothers. Priests, of course, could give invaluable assistance; but the very nature of their duties, especially on Sundays, prevents their bestowing on a lending library the punctual and painstaking attention which it requires.

At present, most of the Catholic lending libraries that one comes across are so defective as to be almost useless. They are intended solely for the pupils of a particular school, or the Children of Mary of a particular sodality, or the members of a particular club. They make no appeal to the general public; they do little or nothing for the diffusion of Catholic literature. In some of them, you will hardly discover a Catholic book; the shelves are filled with more or less harmless Protestant novels, interspersed with a few of the commoner Irish volumes of history or poetry, which look strangely out of place in such a galley. In others you will find that anything between 50 and 80 per cent of the books are by Protestant authors. Others are so tiny that their existence is unknown to many members of the very sodality for which they are intended. A visit to one of these so-called Catholic lending libraries is apt to be a depressing experience.

One would naturally think that the ideal of a Catholic lending library ought to be the diffusion of the greatest possible number of good books among the greatest possible number of people. It is a mere truism to say that a Catholic library should not rest content with doing good in the tiniest and timidest way imaginable: it should not aim merely at doing a minimum of good to a minimum of readers. One would also imagine that it is sheer waste

of money and trouble to stock a library with Protestant books for Catholic readers, who have such books thrust under their eyes at every turn. The primary duty of a Catholic library is to do its utmost for the circulation of Catholic books and magazines, and to let Protestant literature shift for itself.

The Maynooth Synod ordains that competent priests be appointed to examine the books used in our schools and colleges. If we had a resourceful inspector of school libraries and lending libraries in every diocese, his visits would cause the minor earthquake that many of our lending libraries seem to require. Quarterly visits, followed by quarterly reports to the Bishop, would speedily put an end to stagnation and make-believe in our lending libraries.

Most of our convent schools have sodalities of the Children of Mary, with small—excessively small—lending libraries for their exclusive use. Now, the point cannot be too strongly emphasized that these sodalities provide the nuns with a superb opportunity of spreading Catholic literature far and wide. Let us suppose that a given sodality consists of 200 girls, who pay a shilling each (or £10 in all) for the privilege of using the library. Each of these girls could easily enlist three or four of her friends and neighbours as subscribers to the library. This would mean 600 or 800 new subscribers, whose entrance fees would amount to 600s. or 800s., that is, £30 or £40. With £10 from sodality proper, and £30 or £40 from extern subscribers, the nuns could add some 200 or 300 excellent Catholic books to their library, by selecting volumes at prices ranging from 5s. downwards. (In the catalogues of second-hand dealers, such as Baker of London and Woodhouse of Birmingham, may be found hundreds of Catholic books, at prices averaging about 3s. per volume.) Besides, a penny a week from 200 sodalists and 600 or 800 extern subscribers would amount to quite a handsome total in the course of a year; and all this additional money would be available for the enrichment of the library by fresh purchases of Catholic books and magazines. Back numbers of Catholic

magazines and reviews could probably be obtained from the respective publishers on extremely reasonable terms.

The person in charge of a lending library ought to be an enthusiastic book-lover, able and willing to point out the excellences of this or that volume ; otherwise the library is only too likely to prove a failure. Happily, in most convents are to be found nuns, few or many as the case may be, who are keenly interested in books and able to promote the success of a lending library.

It is gratifying to learn that the Sisters of the Holy Faith have Catholic lending libraries for the general public at Clontarf and Haddington Road, Dublin. In their beautiful convent at Glasnevin also, these good Sisters are organizing a sodality of the Children of Mary, and forming a Catholic lending library, which will be open to the public at large. Hence, there is good reason to hope that, before long, Catholic books and magazines will be read every week in every Catholic household of Glasnevin and Drumcondra. Other Sisterhoods and communities of Brothers may be, for all I know, carrying on the same good work elsewhere. If not, let us hope that their patriotic and religious zeal will impel them to do so in the near future.

The gist of this article, on which I have wasted many words, was long ago crystallized into two sentences by Cardinal Logue : ‘ Extreme watchfulness is necessary, especially on the part of those who are burdened with the care of others, but watchfulness is not the only remedy. *Every effort should be made to supply those who read with good, sound, healthful, useful literature.*’

M. H. MACINERNEY, O.P.

FR. THOMAS WHITE, FOUNDER OF THE
IRISH COLLEGE, SALAMANCA
(† MAY 29, 1622)

BY RIGHT REV. MGR. D. J. O'DOHERTY

WHEN, in the second half of the sixteenth century, the schools had been destroyed in Ireland and education practically suppressed, the greatest and most pressing problem with which the Irish Church was faced was to provide for the training and education of her priests. The great Universities of England, till lately as Catholic as any in Christendom, were no longer safe for Catholic youths, much less for candidates for the priesthood. There only remained the schools on the Continent, and to them, despite persecution and penalties, our Catholic people, to their credit be it said, sent and continued to send their sons in a never-ceasing stream. But how were the aspirants to priestly learning to be maintained? Where were the expenses of their education to come from? For, in most cases, their families were so reduced by constant wars and spoilings as to be able to afford them very little support, if any at all. And even if the question of expense were satisfactorily settled, there still remained the difficulty of the unsuitableness of the life of a university free-lance as a preparation for such a heroic, an apostolic mission, and the doubt as to how many would persevere in such conditions or have the soul to face homewards and 'confirm their brethren.'

The results to be derived from such unorganized effort, no matter how well-intentioned, would be always not only uncertain, but far from commensurate with the need that existed. The great means of producing the desired result, or at least of deriving the greatest advantage from all the

circumstances, was to unite the candidates for the priesthood in colleges where they would live without care as to their maintenance and expenses, where they would enjoy a special training for their future mission and where they would bind themselves under oath to follow their heroic vocation, 'even to the shedding of their blood.' To the subject of the present sketch, Father Thomas White, is due the credit of being the first to put these ideas into practice with regard to Ireland. In fact, he would seem to have made the establishment and maintenance of Irish Seminaries his life-aim, and is said to have founded four of them. Whatever may be thought regarding this latter claim, there seems to be no doubt that he was a co-founder of Lisbon College, and to him indisputably belongs the sole glory of having founded 'the grand old College of Salamanca,' as Dr. Healy calls it, the first of its kind, and, during more than two hundred years, the most important Irish Seminary.

On the 29th of this month it will be three hundred years since Father White passed to his eternal reward. It seems therefore a fitting time to present a true account of this extraordinary man—a very human saint, indeed—about whose life and character so little is known and that little so inaccurate.

For a few events in Father White's earlier life we have had to rely on Dr. Healy's *Centenary History of Maynooth*, although unfortunately he does not generally quote his authorities; but from the foundation of Salamanca onwards we have used almost exclusively the original documents in the College 'Archives,' many of them in Father White's own handwriting.

Thomas White, Vitus or Viteo, as he was indifferently called in Spain, was born in Clonmel in the year 1556. All testimonies agree as to place and date. He belonged to the distinguished Anglo-Norman family of his name who had settled in that part of the country. Dr. Healy *supposes* him to have been not only a student of the famous classical school of Dr. White at Kilkenny, but also a

relative (a nephew, he suggests) of the learned master. From charges made against him, and from the partiality of which he was constantly accused to 'sons of merchants,' it is safe to conclude that his family belonged to this class.

Dr. Healy next presents him to us in Valladolid 'about the year 1582,' where he represents him as being engaged in teaching. The latter statement may be true, but we find it hard to accept it without demur, for what we know of Father White does not lead us to regard him as a very learned man. Spanish, the language which he apparently used even in correspondence with fellow-Irishmen, he wrote neither elegantly nor correctly. In fact, he wrote it so incorrectly as to drive one to the conclusion that he was not an educated man. There may be something in the excuse that his having to use Portuguese and Galician so much was confusing, but it is not sufficient to explain his writing Spanish as he did after a residence of more than a quarter of a century in the country. As we shall see, Father White became a Jesuit, but it is remarkable that he never was more than a *Spiritual Coadjutor*, and the fact that this did not prevent him from being raised to the position of Superior is all the more reason for thinking that his literary deficiency must have been marked, when such a useful man, and one apparently so appreciated by his brethren, was not promoted to the Four Vows. Further, there was undoubtedly no lack of learned teachers in that imperial city, with its great University, to which even the Irish students had easy access, and if he did adopt the rôle of Dominie so early in life (he was but twenty-six), he abandoned it quite, for his later life was devoted exclusively to administration and questing. What is more probable is that he himself went to Valladolid as a student, and, as happened in the case of the founder of the Irish College of Seville (Theobald Stapleton, the elder), devoted himself to the care and maintenance of his fellow-students and countrymen. This, undoubtedly was his occupation for some time in Valladolid, and so great was his sympathy with 'the many poor Irish scholars who were in great misery, having no

means to continue their studies nor language to make known their want,' that according to Dr. Healy, who here quotes Dr. William MacDonald, 'he gave them all his own private commodity.'

That is all we know about Father White and his Irish scholars at that time, except that, according to the Archives of the English College of Valladolid, the Irish students were for some time housed in that College (that is between 1589, the date of its foundation, and 1592, the date of the transference of the Irish College to Salamanca), and that King Philip II, in the letter to which we are about to refer, speaks of them (1592) as 'being gathered in a College of this city' (Valladolid), which may refer to the English College or to a house of their own.

There seems to be no doubt that it was Father White who directed the Irish students to the foot of the throne¹ of the great Philip and who was instrumental in getting the all-powerful King to authorize the transference of the College to the much more famous University of Salamanca, still at the height of its glory, and enjoying a unique repute for its Theological studies.

THE FOUNDATION OF SALAMANCA

Philip II gave Father White and his students not one letter, but two—one directed to the Rector, Judge-Chancellor and Chapter of the University of Salamanca and the other to the City Council and its various officers. I do not know if the original of the latter still exists; here we have only a copy—its contents are practically the same as those of the former. This is preserved in the University Archives, and is, notwithstanding its 330 years, quite legible and fresh. It is not an autograph, as Dr. Healy states, but was written by the King's secretary, Jerome Gassol, who signs his name below the well-known signature of the great Catholic

¹ Dr. Healy says 'at San Lorenzo,' which at the present time means the Escorial, situated over 200 kilometres away. Perhaps the reference may be to the Court at Valladolid, where also the Cathedral is dedicated to St. Lawrence.

monarch, the signature used by all the Spanish kings—Yo EL REY (I, the King). Various writers have fallen into strange inaccuracies about the date of this letter, and consequently about the foundation of the College. There is absolutely no room for doubt in the matter. The conclusion of the letter reads : ‘De Valladolid a tres de agosto 1592 años’; that is, ‘from or given at Valladolid, on the 3rd of August, 1592.’¹

Neither are we at any loss as to the date of the actual opening of the College. The fact is registered in an old account-book containing a list of the College property. A marginal note states that ‘the students, accompanied by Father Thomas White, arrived in Salamanca on the 10th of August, 1592.’ We calculate that the journey² from Valladolid would take three days—more, perhaps, if done on foot. Consequently much time was not lost in transferring the College to its new and definite location. When we consider that the ordinary Course did not begin at the University till St. Luke’s Day, 18th October, it is not a little surprising and shows how great was the haste to open the College that the journey should have been undertaken at such a time of the year, when, owing to the heat, it is almost impossible for an ordinary man to travel in Castile. I find the number of students put down as ‘about ten,’ but I do not know if there is any authority for the statement. We can well believe that the number was not less, as the average number received per year for the first nineteen years was about eleven, to judge by the list of students drawn up by Father White himself in 1611.

The King’s letter states ‘that a house had been bought

¹ Father Hogan (*Description of Ireland*) gives 1582 as the date of the founding, and 1592 as the date of the opening of Salamanca College under the three Vice-Rectors, Fathers White, Archer, and Conway. As we shall see, there is no ground for the latter part of the statement, and as far as I know, there is equally little for the first part. Since writing the above, I remark that a very old, apparently a contemporary, copy of the letter wrongly gives the date as the 2nd of August. This explains the general acceptance of this date, as nobody thought of consulting the original.

² 112 kilometres by the present road.

as a residence' for the Irish students. This is incorrect, as for several years they lived in rented houses. As late as 1607 the University was ordered by the Royal Council to give the Irishmen the use of one of the Colleges of the University for two or three years, as 'they were being ejected from the house which they rented and could not find another.' It was only in 1610 that a house was finally purchased.

From the statements left by two of the students¹ who withdrew from the College on the 27th August, less than three weeks after arriving, we conclude that Father White was still in charge of the students, being assisted by Brother Edmund Hor (Hore), probably a Jesuit lay-brother.

It has been taken for granted by all who have written on the College that Father White was a Jesuit at the time of its foundation, and this, notwithstanding the fact that the *Catalogus Hibernorum in Societate*, 1609, published by Father Hogan in the work already referred to, represents him as being only fifteen years in the Society in 1609, which would mean that he entered in 1594, but neither is this correct. For, in the 'Private Diary of the Jesuit Residence of Salamanca,' now preserved in the University, we have over his own unmistakable signature the statement that Father Thomas White entered the Society on the 11th June, 1593. Here is the entry:—

A 11 de Junio del dicho año fue recibido en este Collegio de la Compañia de Jesus de Salamanca el Padre Thomas Vitus natural de la Villa de Clon Mel de la diocesis de Guaterfordia y Elismor que es en el Reyno de Irlanda . . . y asi lo firmo de su nombre a 12 de Julio del dicho año de 1593.

(Signed), THOMAS VITUS.

Possibly, however, the discrepancy is due to the fact that the data about Father White were collected in 1608, though not tabulated till 1609. This is all the more probable, as the list also makes him a year younger than he really was, while on the other hand, there are other

¹ Vide *Arch. Hibern.*, vol. iv. pp. 2 and 3.

inaccuracies in this list that cannot be explained by the general application of this theory.

It is likewise a mistake to suppose, as has generally been done, that Father White was the responsible Superior of the College from its foundation in 1592 till towards the end of his life or that the College was governed during this period by the triumvirate White-Archer-Conway. It is clear that, if the new foundation was to be 'under the protection of the College of the Society of Jesus,' as stated in King Philip's letter, that is, to all intents and purposes a Jesuit College, the good Fathers would not be content to leave it to the direction of a secular, even though such a secular were as identified with them in everything as Father White apparently was. It would seem, however, that there was some difficulty in finding a suitable Superior, and that the Jesuit Province of Castile, if it had any professed Fathers of the Irish race, had no one fitted for the position. At all events, it was not till the following year, 1593, that a Superior was provided by calling Father Archer, who had become a Jesuit in 1581,¹ from Flanders.

As to Father Richard Conway, he began his Theology only in 1599, when he is still styled Frater, and he does not appear as attached to the College till 1601 or 1602. It is very difficult with the data at our disposal to know always who was the responsible Superior of the College. Father James Archer was both the responsible and actual Superior till the Summer of 1596, when he went to Ireland to collect funds for the College, and it would appear that, as senior amongst his Irish brethren, he was regarded as Superior on his return and whenever in residence, until his appointment by the General as Prefect of the Irish Mission in 1604. [Father White, however, as we shall see, was in the service of the College [from 1596 onwards, and became at least acting Superior in 1597. Beginning with the former year, which is the time at which he first appears regularly in the College Account Books, we have made as detailed

¹ According to the Maynooth History, though the Jesuit List of 1609 gives 1573.

a calendar as possible of his activities ; but before proceeding to give the outlines of his life from this source, we must first tell what we know of the earlier years from 1592 to 1596.

Dr. Healy states that Father White was, with Father John Holing, S.J.,¹ the co-founder of the Irish College at Lisbon, and that this College was opened by both on the 1st of February, 1593. Therefore we may take it that Father White left Salamanca a short time after its foundation and set out for Lisbon on the first of his many long journeys. When we consider the then conveniences of travel, the nature of the highways and by-ways, the dangers of the road and the fact that the distance is some 350 miles, we get some idea of the character and spirit of the man who, not content with founding one college, immediately, cheerfully and of his own initiative, sets out on such a journey with only the faint hope of founding another to inspire him. What faith, what zeal, what courage must he not have had ! No doubt it was his high example which some years later, about 1610, inspired a student of that College to undertake a similar journey to Seville with a like object, namely, to re-establish the Irish College there, which some time before had been 'wiped out by a great plague' (probably that of 1600-1), and afterwards to go on to the capital of Spain and found yet another college.²

We are ashamed to say that we know very little about the Lisbon foundation. For some time, especially during Father White's lifetime, there were very close relations between the two Colleges, students sometimes passing from one to the other, but from the middle of the seventeenth century onwards, probably because of the separation of the two countries, there is no evidence of such intercourse. The English College of Lisbon still flourishes, whereas the Irish College was suppressed at the beginning of the last century. Why ? Perhaps the Irish Dominicans of Corpo

¹ The same writer states that this Father was also a co-founder of Salamanca, but we have met no evidence of this.

² This was the Venerable Archdeacon Theobald Stapleton, who met his death in the massacre at the Rock of Cashel in 1647.

Santo, who, I understand, inherited whatever was left of the College revenues, would give us a history of an institution which sheltered so many learned and holy men, amongst others Luke Wadding, O.S.F., his cousin, Michael Wadding, S.J., Patrick Comerford, Bishop of Waterford, and Theobald Stapleton.¹

About this time Father White seems to have decided to join the Society of Jesus, and, returning to Salamanca, entered the Society, as we have said, on the 11th of June, 1593.

Until the Summer of 1596 all we are told about Father White is that in 1595 he was Superior in Lisbon. That he was in Lisbon at the time we do not doubt, but again we find it hard to believe that a man who had just left the Novitiate would be given such a charge and placed over Father Holing, who had been in the Society for eleven or twelve years.² Father White presumably spent a year in the Jesuit Novitiate at Villagarcia, where he was later to send so many of his young fellow-countrymen, and it is quite possible that he went to Lisbon in 1594. He reached Salamanca on the 30th of June, 1596, having come from Bilbao. How long he was in the latter place or how he travelled thither, whether overland or directly by sea, we do not know. That he was not unmindful of his beloved foundation in Salamanca is clear from the fact that, amongst other things, he brought with him to Salamanca six-and-a-half 'Cueros de Irlanda' (Irish hides, probably tanned) which were sold at 24 reales each, that is, nearly £2 each of our present currency, some shirts which were sold at 68 reales, and a 'cojín' or saddle-pad, as well as a respectable sum of money—all, except the 'cojín,' which he had bought in Valladolid probably for use on his journey being offerings received for the College.

¹ Dr. Healy states that Stephen White, S.J., 'one of the most learned men of his time,' was a student of Lisbon, having gone there from Trinity College. Again we do not know on what authority, but as a matter of fact, Stephen White, like Florence Conry, figures amongst the class of eight, who in 1595 all got their B.A. in the University of Salamanca, and entered the class of First Theology.

² He entered in 1583.

At this time the Superior, Father James Archer, the most romantic figure in our history, must have been making final preparations for his hazardous journey to Ireland, where he was to suffer so many things, including even special attention from her *gracious* Majesty, Queen Elizabeth, and where he played such a noble and important part during those fateful years. The fact that Father Thomas White, though available and actually in the College, was not appointed his substitute, bears out what we have stated above about his position. Father Juan de Salamanca (primus), a Spaniard, was made Superior, but that Father White too continued in the service of the College is proved by the fact that a careful register of his various absences from the time of Father Salamanca's arrival on the 1st of August, was kept in the Account Books.

FATHER WHITE'S COLLECTING TOURS

On the 1st of December, 1596, Father White set out on the first of his many and great questing expeditions on behalf of the College. As these journeys form such an important part of his life, it will not be out of place to quote here the account we have of the various places and persons he visited during the six months, from that date till the 7th of May following, when he returned. We give the list as Father Salamanca gives it in the Book of Receipts, with the amount contributed by each person.

Orense, the Bishop, 550 reales; the Chapter, 100; Bishop of Lugo, 300; Bishop of Tuy, 100; the Chapter of Tuy, 66; Chapter of Santiago, 275 (all these places are in Galicia, the extreme North-west); Bishop of Badajoz (in the South), 200; the Adelantado (Governor), 300; Count de Lemos, 275; Don Diego Sarmiento, 22; Abbot of Monfero, 22; Abbot of Sobrado, 100; Abbot of San Clodio, 40; Abbot of Oya, 44; Abbot of Celanova, 132; Abbot of St. Martin's of Santiago, 100; Abbot of Samos, 66; Abbot of St. Stephen's Ribadesil (towards the middle of the Asturian coast), 132; the Irish merchants of Bayona, 200 (in Galicia on the Atlantic coast, near Portugal); Jesuit College, Montforte, 60; Abbot of St. Vincent's, Montforte, 100; Jesuit College, Braga (in the North of Portugal), 25; Chapter of Braga, 100; a Canon of Braga, 200; the Vicar of Valencia, 2; another priest, 2; the Governor of the Port, 12; Bishop of Miranda (not far from Bilbao), 25, with a promise for the future; a Canon of Lisbon, 25; the College of Eborá, 50.

It is not easy to say what route Father White followed,

but, from the towns mentioned, he covered an area considerably greater than twice the size of Ireland.

The sums given with 'other 1,400 reales collected in Galicia' and handed in earlier, make a total of over 5,000 reales, an amount sufficient at the then cost of living to keep nearly seven students for a year.

Here are the other principal journeys of which we have an account during the time of Father White's connexion with Salamanca (the approximate distance in miles from Salamanca is inserted in brackets after the names of each place) :—

- 1598—May and June, Bilbao (250), where he got '200 reales from the Irish merchants' there.
- 1599—11th October–15th November, Merida (180), 'accompanying the Bishop of Ossory,' Dr. Strong.
- 1599 or 1600—Villagarcia, Province of Palencia (90), 'with the Irish Novices.'
- 1600—8th–17th January, Merida, 'with the Bishop of Ossory.'
- 2nd–23rd June, 'following the King.'
- June, Valladolid (60).
- September, Valladolid, El Escorial and Madrid (120).
- December, Madrid.
- 1601—March, Braga (230), and Lisbon (350), both in Portugal.
- 1602—June, Compostella (400).

Father White was in Lisbon, as we shall see, from the end of 1604 till 1608. 'In 1608,' we read, 'Father White first began to quest in the churches.'

In the Autumn of 1609 he was in Seville (400); in January, 1610, in Burgos (120), 'early in the same year in the Port Towns [of the Northern coast we take it], about the Fishing,' that is, the privilege granted by the Holy See to fishermen of fishing on a number of Sundays and holidays each year, provided they gave the proceeds to the College of Salamanca.

In 1611 he was in Portugal.

1613—Toledo (175). This year, he was also sent to Santiago (Compostella) on the difficult mission of taking over possession of the Irish College there from the secular clergy who had been in charge since its foundation in 1606.

1617, June—Santiago, on a mission to which we shall refer.

Early in 1618 he finally left the College, setting out on a questing tour to Italy and Rome. From Naples he sent 800 reales, received 'from Don Carlos Characha,' as well as 50 ducats (=575 reales), the balance of 200 ducats taken with him as *viaticum* or travelling expenses.

The Circular Letter announcing his death refers to 'his almost uninterrupted journeys and labours,' and continues :—

His dress was of the poorest, and in travelling, when he always gave extraordinary edification to all seculars whom he met, his ordinary food was bread and a little cheese. God enabled him to gain the good will of the Princes, Prelates and Chapters with whom he had to treat, so that they very willingly gave the large donations which he collected, for they recognized in him a man of extraordinary zeal and most singular virtue.

SUPERIOR OF THE COLLEGE

Father Archer's substitute, Father Salamanca, left the College, and his place was taken by Father White on the 1st of October, 1597, and from that time till the 28th of December, 1604, except, perhaps, during the short intervals when Father Archer was at home, Father White was Superior. We may remark that during this period, in 1603 to be exact, he purchased 'a house, a wine-cellar and a tun' in a village of the province of Valladolid called Alaejos, which the College still possesses.

His life at this time must have been considerably embittered by the attacks made upon the Anglo-Irish Jesuits, but principally¹ upon himself, on account of his administration of the College and his attitude towards and treatment of the students of the 'Old-Irish' race or perhaps we should say those who came from any part of Ireland except the towns of the South-Eastern quarter of the island and Galway City. He was accused of refusing to receive them into the College, 'or if he received any, of treating them so harshly that they were forced to leave.' To this main charge others were adjoined, regarding the exclusion of the Irish language, the allegiance of the Anglo-Irish to Queen

¹ Father Archer alone was excepted from the charge of being pro-English, though seemingly included in the others.

Elizabeth and 'her wicked sect' by which they became schismatical, their opposition to the Hispano-Irish forces in the recent wars, favouritism of the Superiors towards their own relatives, misappropriation of College funds and others of a like character. These charges were contained in various petitions presented to the King or the Council of State, the first and principal being presented by Red Hugh O'Donnell in his 'own and O'Neill's name,' but the moving spirit was supposed to be Father Florence Conry, an ex-student of the College and shortly afterwards Archbishop of Tuam. The King was asked to remove Father White and to appoint a Spanish Rector in his stead, so that 'in future strict equality should be observed between the Four Provinces.'

Copies or notes of several replies on behalf of Father White and his Anglo-Irish colleagues are preserved in our Archives, but they substantially agree in denying the charges and explaining that Ulstermen and Connaughtmen had not the necessary education for entering the College, for which reason also fewer presented themselves from these provinces, and 'those received were by nature or by training more unruly than those from the more civilized parts.'

From the documents, although they are voluminous, it is most difficult, if not impossible, to decide on the merits of the controversy, but while allowing for the fierce political animus and the consequent exaggeration on both sides, we find it hard to believe that the main charges should be urged by such responsible people, if they had no foundation in fact, and whatever the explanation, it is perfectly clear that the bulk of the students of the time were from the Counties of Waterford, Wexford, and Kilkenny. As to the charges concerning the administration of the College, it is unfortunate that the Expense Book of the period should have disappeared soon after, all the more so that we have evidence that one at least of the Superiors, Father Conway, did on occasions apply College funds for other religious purposes. In fact, in some of the replies, the position is taken up that, whereas the King's Grant

should be equally divided over the Four Provinces, the other funds collected by the exertions of the Superiors might be employed as seemed good to them, the supposition, of course, being that they would be used for kindred purposes.

In obedience to the King's command, Spanish Rectors were appointed, three of them in succession ruling the College from 1605 to 1608. This direction was revoked in the latter year, when it would seem that Father Conway became Superior.

Father White left Salamanca on the 28th of December, 1604, and was Rector in Lisbon during the whole or part of the time till 1608, when, as we have seen, 'he began to quest in the churches.' Early in 1610 he again returned to the College and succeeded Father Conway as Superior at the end of April or beginning of May, and continued in charge till the beginning of 1618. This year he went to Italy and, on his return to Spain, went to Santiago, where he was Rector up to the day of his death, the 29th of May, 1622.

HIS DEATH AND CHARACTER

'To-day, Sunday,' announces the Circular Obituary Letter already referred to, 'at seven o'clock in the morning, our Lord called Father Thomas White to the reward of his great labours and merit. Owing to age and over-work and notwithstanding the assistance of three doctors, who tried every means, he died on the fifteenth day of a fever arising out of a cold. In his last illness he gave splendid proof of the sanctity of his life, for whereas death overtook him at a time when he should have regretted it most, engaged as he was in the direction of this Seminary, he disposed himself by most fervent acts of resignation to the Will of God, regretting only that he had not served Him more, and this even in moments of delirium.'

It is not easy after such a lapse of time, and with the documents at our disposal, to form an accurate estimate of Father White and his character. Still, as we have seen, certain aspects of his life and work leave a very definite

impression. There are a few other details which will help us.

The traditional impression of Father White is very probably founded partly on the Obituary Letter referred to and partly on a portrait of him which is still preserved. This painting represents an exceedingly mild, ascetic man, with a legend beginning : 'The Venerable Father Thomas White.' But it is clearly idealistic and not drawn from the original. The fact that there is a mistake in the date of his death goes to prove that it was painted a considerable time after his death.

Here are some further paragraphs from the Obituary Letter : 'Notwithstanding his constant journeys and labours, his interior recollection was extraordinary. His spirit of penance was great, and despite his advanced years he never abandoned the use of the hair-cloth and took the discipline every day. Through him and the four¹ Seminaries which he founded in Spain the Faith has been preserved in Ireland, a fact proclaimed with gratitude by its entire people.'

But to form an estimate of a man's character, nothing is comparable to his own words describing his conduct in an event which he regards as of the first importance. We have been fortunate in discovering two fragments in Father White's well-known hand, which turn out to be a complete and lengthy letter of this kind in Spanish. It is endorsed² : 'The account of the getting possession of the King's house in Santiago on the 16th June, 1617,' and is a letter written to Father Conway, Rector of Santiago College, but temporarily absent in Madrid.

The letter, dated from Santiago, 17th June, 1617,

¹ The reference must be, in addition to the Colleges of Salamanca and Lisbon, to the taking over by the Jesuits of Santiago and Seville, the former in 1613, the latter in 1619. Both these Colleges were founded by secular priests and their taking over by the Jesuits was bitterly resented by the Old-Irish, who did not hesitate to accuse the Anglo-Irish Fathers of 'being moved by ambition and self-interest,' and of 'having destroyed four Colleges, just as in France.' (Letter of Father M'Carthy, ex-Rector of Santiago, in our Archives.)

² By Father Conway.

opens with an account of Father White's post-haste journey from Salamanca, of which he was Rector at the time, to Santiago. This journey would usually take a fortnight; Father White accomplished it in just a week. He had a Royal Order, giving the Irish Seminary the use of a house belonging to the King, but he learned, on arrival at Santiago, that Lady Ellen O'Sullivan, the wife of Domhnall, the last Chief of Beare and Bantry, had another Order, despatched by the Council of State or the Council of War, giving the O'Sullivans the use of the same house. Both Orders would have to be presented to the Marquis de Caracena, Captain-General and Governor of Galicia, who lived in La Coruña, a coast-town some forty miles distant. Hearing that Lady O'Sullivan had already ordered mounts and was prevented only by the weather from setting out for La Coruña, Father White 'eat a mouthful, and although it was raining pitchforks,' set out at once. Next morning, at ten o'clock, he arrived, and waiting only to take off his spurs, presented himself to the Governor. They were apparently good friends, and soon agreed that the best policy was that dictated by the old proverb—*possession is nine points of the law*. Father White's Order was directed to the Marquis as Civil-Governor, and as such he could not take any step in the matter without consulting the Provincial Council, but the matter was urgent, so he would write to the Bishop (Archbishop?) of Santiago to put the Irish Seminary into possession of the Royal House. Father White begged to be excused from lunching with the Marquis, and went to join 'Roberto,'¹ who was waiting outside for him.

After luncheon Father White wished to take a little rest, but a note came from the Governor to return at once to the Palace. The urgency arose from the fact that Lady O'Sullivan, having heard of Father White's sudden arrival in and departure from Santiago, had determined to set out for La Coruña at once, and had sent a servant

¹ Probably Robert Comerford of Waterford, who had been living in La Coruña for many years.

forward with her Royal Order. The Marquis could not afford to disregard the Order of the Council, so that Father White would have to set out at once to carry out the little plan. 'You will carry a letter to the Bishop, written with my own hand, asking him to put you into the House with the greatest secrecy and despatch, even though you only get possession of the portal. The minute he has read my letter, let him burn it, so that no one may know that I have anything to do with the matter,' and said he, 'if tomorrow you get possession, how delighted I shall be.'

That evening, on the journey back to Santiago—for this man of iron, although over sixty years of age, set out at once—Father White met Lady O'Sullivan, who upbraided him for his want of courtesy in not going to see her in Santiago. She then asked him what the Governor did about his Order. 'I replied that the Governor said to me, "that if the King would follow his advice, he would not give the House either to the Seminary or to O'Sullivan."' She said that she believed it, and that he was not favourably disposed towards us. With this she felt very safe' (!)

Next day all was carried out according to plan. The Archbishop was quite willing, and 'called together the justices, civil and ecclesiastical.' Father Archer, who seems to have been in charge of the Seminary during Father Conway's absence, Father Valle¹ and the Irish students were also cited. There was still, however, a slight obstacle to the success of the venture. The house, or at least part of it, was occupied by a widow named Doña Francisca, whether Spanish or Irish we know not. The Archbishop explained his mission to her 'in such a way, that she was obliged to yield to his will,' but only 'after she had given way to many wailings and tears, and stated the expenses she had been at—for they were ejecting her from her house—and a thousand other things.' That night, Father White and his students supped and slept 'in the King's House as in their very own.' But Father White was still un-

¹ Probably Father James Valle, a Waterford man, who came to the College in 1600, and joined the Jesuits the same year.

satisfied, for the house was too small for the two households, and Father Conway was besought to consider what arrangements could be made, as 'we don't know how to get this widow out of her quarters, if the King or we do not recompense her in some way.' Further down Father White admits that 'to pitch her into the street would be a hard thing.' The rest of this part of the letter is taken up with means employed or suggested to secure them in possession and to get rid of the widow.

The second part begins :—

Father dearest, here I received your reverence's of the 7th inst. If O'Sullivan could see and know what you do after reading this, wouldn't he open his eyes and see what he's up against, and those whom God assists so wonderfully, without deception or falsehood, but only the service of God and the common good. Wouldn't he take care not to make enemies for himself. He never had any luck when he opposed our affairs, and if they were not properly directed, neither could we help ourselves nor could God help us as He did. Patience, silence and action—is the motto with such people. I expect another bombardment in four days from his wife. Little they know what they're up against. Give thanks to God, and say a Mass for my intention—and don't give any (?) Berhaven. I'll be preparing the minds of people here not to give him ear or credit. If you speak with O'Sullivan and see that he speaks disdainfully and bitingly of us and our affairs, tell him plainly that we'll reply to him, and we'd be sorry, indeed, that he should be incommoded by our defending ourselves.

He repeats that everybody was highly pleased at his success, and asks Father Conway to spread the fact abroad. A P.S. ends : 'Many a day and many a year since I wrote a letter with such *gusto*, or carried out an affair with greater caution.' It is scarcely necessary to add that the references to the O'Sullivans are more familiar than respectful. Lady O'Sullivan is 'Elena,' 'la de O'Sullivan' or 'la de Berhaven'—the O'Sullivan one or the Bearhaven one.

The opposition between Father White and his Anglo-Irish colleagues on the one hand, and O'Sullivan Beare, representing the old-Irish families of the South-West of Ireland, on the other, was very marked since the taking over by the Jesuits of Santiago College in 1613. This College had been founded and sustained by Phillip III expressly for the education of the sons of those Chieftains,

and Father White succeeded, not only in getting possession of it, but in having it converted into a clerical Seminary, excluding thereby all, even those young noblemen, who would not study for the priesthood. The wisdom and prudence of such a policy of monopolizing the Irish Seminaries of the Peninsula, and apparently even of France, is very questionable, not only because the administration of these Seminaries had evoked such a storm of criticism and opposition from outside, but also because the relations of the Superiors with their Seminarians were and continued to be far from harmonious. In defence of Father White and his colleagues, we can only say that they were actuated by high motives, and no doubt believed that the interest of religion could be better served by themselves than by others.

Father White was a man of such undaunted zeal and energy as is capable of every effort and sacrifice to gain his end. He, no doubt, was a very wonderful man, but as we have seen, he was very human too. He held fiercely to all his beliefs and predilections, and one of the latter was undoubtedly the Anglo-Irish race from which he sprang. But he loved the Catholic Faith above everything, and to its defence and preservation he sacrificed his ease and devoted his life in a way that is given to few men to do. There is no doubt that the College of Salamanca, at least from the point of view of numbers and revenues, was more successful during the period of Father White's connexion with it than at any later until, towards the end of the eighteenth century, the Colleges of Santiago, Seville, and Alcala were united with it. In an introduction to a list of students, written in April, 1611, by his own hand, nineteen years after the College of Salamanca had been founded, he sums up the activities of the College in the following way : ' Without including numerous visitors, Bishops, friars, priests and laymen, 208 students have been inmates of the College. Of these, thirty have met holy deaths in Ireland after martyrdom, torments, persecutions and labours. Sixty-eight are actually working in the vineyard of the Lord in

Ireland. Twenty-two died in Salamanca, and eighty-one joined various religious Orders.' He then goes on to refer to the number of students who had become Archbishops, Bishops, Doctors in Theology and other sciences, Professors of Grammar, Rhetoric, Arts and Theology, Superiors of religious Orders, Vicars-General, Authors and Preachers. 'Of this number, not one was known either from torments or persecution, threats or bribes, to have shown any weakness in faith, religion or constancy, thanks be to God.' This is the best testimony to himself and his work. Whatever we may think of his politics and of his conduct on certain occasions, we have no doubt that he acted according to his lights, and therefore we cannot deny him the meed of praise that is due to a great pioneer and indefatigable worker. He fought the good fight, he kept the faith, and through the Colleges which he founded or helped to establish, he did more than one man's part to hand down that same faith to succeeding generations of Irishmen.

D. J. O'DOHERTY.

[May, 1922.]

THE CHIEFTAINS OF FERMANAGH

BY REV. PAUL WALSH, M.A.

IV

IN an earlier number of the I. E. RECORD ¹ reference was made to the course of Maguire's campaigns, down to the opening of the negotiations between the Ulster Princes and the Government in the Winter of 1595. In passing on to the remaining years of his career, it is unnecessary to deal with these negotiations in detail. Suffice it to say that it was arranged that O'Neill, O'Donnell, and the other chiefs in rebellion were to enter conference with Sir Henry Wallop, the Treasurer, and Sir Robert Gardner, Chief Justice, at Dundalk, about the middle ² of January, 1596. Tyrone, the chief spokesman, refused point blank to enter the town, and after a few days the first meeting took place on January 20, near Sir John Bedlowe's house in the open country.³ The joint demands of the Irish had been communicated the day before in a statement in which Maguire was the next signatory after O'Neill and O'Donnell.⁴ The Commissioners insisted on each setting down his own grievances and demands, and to this proposal they assented.⁵ Meanwhile the Lord Deputy had rejected their original claims, but instructed ⁶ his agents to 'endeavour

¹ January, 1922.

² The commission to Wallop and Gardner was dated January 8, Fiant of Elizabeth, 5972. They left Dublin on the 12th, and arrived at Dundalk on the 15th. O'Clery's account of the conference is very misleading. He says the Commissioners were the Earl of Ormond and Archbishop Myler Magrath, and is responsible for various other errors (*Life of Aodh Ruadh*, §§ 67-8).

³ The Commissioners to the Lord Deputy and Council, Jan. 20 (*Cal. of Carew Papers*, 139).

⁴ *Ibid.* 133, 138.

⁵ The Commissioners to the Lord Deputy and Council, Jan. 23 (*ibid.* 144).

⁶ Lord Deputy to the Commissioners, Jan. 22 (*ibid.* 145).

to conclude a prolongation of the cessation, considering we are not provided for them,' adding, in a missive from himself and the Council, 'you know how slenderly we stand furnished for wars and troubles.' The cessation was to have expired on January 31, but on the 26th a renewal was granted with some difficulty, extending it to April 1, or May 1, 'unless warning be given to the contrary.'¹ When this was secured the Commissioners produced the Queen's terms to O Neill and O Donnell, to which they made their respective answers. 'O Donnell's demands did not vary much from the former, and he refused to perform the articles propounded on her Majesty's behalf. The next morning he departed homeward, with Mac Mahon, Ever mac Collo, Sir John O Dogherty, Maguire, and the rest, except the Earl, his brother Cormac, and their followers, who intend to depart this evening.'² So ended the first stage of the conference.

On the return of Wallop and Gardner to Dublin, the latter was selected to attend the Queen and the Privy Council touching the treaty with the rebels. He set out for London on February 18. The Queen was furious because so little had been accomplished by her Irish government. She urged that both O Neill and O Donnell had already made their submissions, as indeed they had,³ on October 18, 1595, and that the sole business of her Deputy and Council was to make out pardons in accordance with the submissions, the chiefs in the beginning having simply stood upon the Queen's mercy without condition. In response to the demands of the rebels she had a new set of answers drawn up, 'such as shall be fit for rebels to receive,' and gave direction that they should be delivered before the end of the cessation by a new commission, consisting of Sir John Norris, the Commander-in-Chief, and Sir Geoffrey Fenton, the Secretary to the Council. The Deputy and Council were soundly rated for their mismanagement of

¹ *Cal. of Carew Papers*, Ibid. 148, 149, 158, 159.

² The Commissioners to the Lord Deputy and Council, Jan. 30 (ibid. 165).

³ Ibid. 125.

affairs in almost every part of Ireland.¹ Maguire's claims have been already² referred to. The following were the Queen's answers³ to them :—

1. The request for liberty of conscience savours of a compact with others. Her Majesty never means to grant that liberty to any subject, though heretofore she has acted mercifully.

2. Whereas he requires to have no garrison nor officers placed in his country, but to be governed as MacMahon's country shall be, she will take care for the good government of both their countries.

3. Whereas he protests that his disloyalty was occasioned by his hard usage, she never heard that he has been misused. If complaint had been made to her, she would have seen speedy redress. But as he acknowledges his fault, she will grant him his pardon, and cause his complaints to be examined.

4. Where he maketh request to have restitution of the lands, both spiritual and temporal, upon a rent, her Majesty thinketh it strange that either he or any other of the offenders at this time should have a conceipt to demand spiritual lands, wherein never any one of his ancestors had interest. And yet nevertheless the state of the spiritual lands shall be considered, and such of them as shall be thought meet to be granted to the inhabitants of the country, being obedient subjects, they shall have the preferment thereof.

Sir Robert Gardner returned from England on April 5, and the new commission, consisting of Norris and Fenton, set out for Dundalk on Good Friday, April 9, 'to treat with Tyrone, O Donnell, and the other principal traitors.' Terms were submitted a few days later, and on April 23 the Commissioners reported to London that 'upon signing the conclusion, Maguire, Macmahon, Sir John O Reilly, Philip O Reilly, Shane mac Brian, and Ross O Ferrall, made their personal submissions in the market-place upon their knees.'⁴ The Earl's pardon was issued in the following month, but on July 16 it was still doubtful whether he would accept it or not. Those of the other leaders were never completed. The fact is, the peace was not seriously intended. The chiefs were at this very period expecting the

¹ *Cal. of Carew Papers*, 166.

² See I. E. RECORD, January 1922, p. 3.

³ *Cal. of Carew Papers*, 169.

⁴ *Ibid.* 244, 172; *Cal. of State Papers*, 512.

arrival of help from Spain.¹ Accordingly the Irish Government declared that 'although at the conclusion made with Ulster in April last, Tyrone, the Macmahons, Maguire, the O Reillys, and the residue of that province, undertook to send in their pledges immediately, and to employ agents authorized severally to sue out their pardons, yet none except Tyrone have sent in their pledges, and none have made means to solicit their pardons.'² Maguire's attitude is sufficiently explained by the letter³ he addressed to Philip II, on May 23: ' . . . I was the very first of all in this kingdom, not of my own authority, but through reliance on God's help and your clemency, who had the courage to rouse the wrath of the Queen of England. I have incurred infinite losses in consequence. But all these I care little about, because of your good will towards me. . . . The Lord O Neill, whom we all obey, has written our unanimous request.' When, in the end, Tyrone consented⁴ to accept his pardon, Maguire and the others still stood out, remaining free to harass the Queen's supporters wherever an opportunity offered. Similar opposition in Leinster was encouraged by O Neill,⁵ Fiacha mac Aodha Ui Bhroin (or

¹ Assistance from Spain was expected about May or June, 1596, in response to appeals sent out the previous Autumn. A report of Richard Stanton, master of a ship of Cork, mentioned that 'three principal Spanish captains and Mr. Ryan with 60 soldiers' were ready to sail from Lisbon for Tyrone's country on March 20. Early in May, Captain Francis Stafford announced from Newry that they had landed, and that O Neill and O Donnell had gone to interview them. O Clery states they landed at Killybegs, in Tirconnell. After the interview with Alonzo Cobos, the Spanish envoy, at Lifford, the chiefs wrote a joint letter to Sir John Norris, stating that their answer to the King of Spain was 'that they were again received into the favour of their own Princess, and could not satisfy his errands.' The actual letter delivered to the envoy shows that his arrival had decided them to continue the war, and that they were, at this point, only biding their time till further Spanish aids would arrive. See *Cal. of State Papers*, 517-9; Murphy, *Life of Hugh Roe*, lxxviii.

² Lord Deputy and Council to the Privy Council, July 16 (*Cal. of State Papers*, 34).

³ Murphy, *Life of Hugh Roe*, lxxix.

⁴ July 20, *Cal. of State Papers*, 44.

⁵ For example, Philip O Reilly, Macmahon, Maguire, and O Rourke plundered Eastmeath in the month of October (*ibid.* 145). As for Feagh mac Hugh's relations with O Neill, see the remarkable document of July 6 (*ibid.* 32).

Feagh mac Hugh) being the most remarkable rebel in that province. There was not, however, any very notable action on the part of these chiefs during the remainder of the year 1596.

We have seen above that help from Spain was expected in consequence of an interview held with the Spanish envoy, who landed at Killybegs in May. In April, 1597, another courier arrived in Tirconnell, and conferred with O'Neill, O'Donnell, and Maguire.¹ True to his method, O'Clery, describing² this meeting, totally ignores O'Neill and Maguire. Earlier in the year (January) O'Donnell had carried out an extensive raid on the Earl of Clanrickard's country, in the course of which he burned Athenry and attacked Galway. Sir Conyers Clifford, a new Governor of Connacht, arrived shortly afterwards, and met with some success. The result was that in May one of his subordinates³ was able to announce that the Governor had driven out some of the rebels 'where Mac William, O'Rourke, and Maguire, assisted by O'Donnell, were in a manner fully possessed of the whole province.'

A new Deputy, Lord Thomas Burgh, entered office on May 22, and one of his first despatches announced that 'Tyrone's brother Cormack, with Maguire, Macmahon, and the forces of O'Rourke, assisted with a great company of Tyrone's own forces, brake into Westmeath, and burned many villages as far as Mullingar.'⁴ We learn from the Four Masters⁵ that the damage done at the last-mentioned place was extremely heavy. Later in the year the Governor of Connacht made a determined attack on O'Donnell in the neighbourhood of Ballyshannon, but was obliged to fall back on Athlone. The principal supporters of O'Donnell in the engagement were Hugh Maguire and Brian Og O'Rourke.⁶ Their co-operation

¹ Ibid. 271.

² *Life of Aodh Ruadh*, § 74.

³ Maurice Kyffin to Burghley (*Cal. of State Papers*, 291).

⁴ Ibid. 296, 301.

⁵ *Annals*, vi. 2038.

⁶ *Life of Aodh Ruadh*, § 80; Clifford's account of the battle will be found in *Cal. of State Papers*, 373.

defeated Lord Burgh's strategy, who had hoped to crush the North by attacking it simultaneously from Connacht and the direction of Dundalk.¹

On December 22, 1597, Tyrone made a temporary submission, and was granted a truce for two months. His petition was sent in on the same date.² O'Donnell's and Maguire's statements of grievances were not then ready, and they do not appear to have ever been presented. Within the two months' truce it is interesting to find Sir Conyers Clifford putting in his claim for a share in the expected loot of Ulster. Writing to Sir Robert Cecil, he says:—

I do by a letter desire your Honour's father to favour me, that the countries of Tyrconnell and Fermanagh, which are the countries of O'Donnell and Maguire, and for which countries I had a patent from my Lord Burgh, as large as he might grant them, that they may not be passed unto any other man's charge, if upon the settling of the country, Her Majesty will have them under government, but that they may be annexed unto the government I have; as well because I must endure the brunt for the recovering of them, as also they lie fittest to the province of Connaught; and in this my suit I most humbly desire your Honour's favour.

Clifford's desire was not gratified. The war went on, and he himself was slain at the Curliou Mountains the next year.

Brian Og O'Rourke went over to the English side⁴ in February, 1598. This chief's wife was, as already indicated, a sister of Maguire, and the latter at once fell under suspicion of O'Neill and O'Donnell. He was arrested⁵ by them in April. The arrest cannot have been a serious affair, for, a few months afterwards, the three principal Northern rebels were approaching the Pale in strength.⁶ A little later, at the great battle of the Yellow Ford, where the Northern army so completely defeated Sir Henry

¹ See Bagwell, *Ireland Under the Tudors*, iii. 284.

² Fynes Moryson, ii. 210; *Cal. of State Papers* (1598), 2, 6; *Cal. of Carew Papers*, 274.

³ *Cal. of State Papers*, 32.

⁴ Fynes Moryson, ii. 212.

⁵ *Cal. of State Papers*, 116.

⁶ *Ibid.* 204.

Bagenal's forces, Maguire was in command of the Irish cavalry.¹

After his great victory over the English, O'Neill's plans and operations assumed larger dimensions. Early in 1599 he despatched his son Conn with a large force into Leinster and Munster with a view to securing new allies in these provinces. Part of the same policy was O'Donnell's irruption into Thomond, which took place soon afterwards. Maguire was one of the leaders in this latter expedition, and distinguished himself in the neighbourhood of Inchiquin, in Co. Clare. The spoils on the occasion were immense, and were transported safely to Ballymote by way of Athenry²—a clear proof of the helpless condition to which the English power in Connacht was now reduced. A further crushing blow was administered by O'Donnell's great victory at the Curliou Mountains, on the Feast of the Assumption, August 15, 1599.

The following year brings us to the end of Maguire's very remarkable career. In pursuance of the plan of uniting all Ireland against the English, O'Neill invaded Meath, Leinster, and Munster early in the year 1600. We can follow the progress of this extraordinary expedition very closely in the contemporary papers, in the *Four Masters*, and in other authorities. To show that he meant business, I shall quote a little-known letter which he addressed at this time to Sir John MacCochlan, a chieftain of some importance in the west of King's County. Specimens of O'Neill's Irish are so rare that the present document possesses considerable interest:—

Ar mbennacht chugaib a Mэг Cochláin : do ghlacamair bar leitir agus issé thuigmid uirre nach ffuil agoip agá dénumh acht millsecht bhriathar agus sínteoracht aimsire. Ar gcuid-ne don adpar, cebé duine nach biaidh leinn agus nach gcaithfe ar son na córa, tuigmid gur duine inár n-aghaid in duine sin. Dá bhrígh sin, gach áit a ndéna sip-si bar maith féin,

¹ 'Macguier qui praeerat equitatui' (O'Sullivan, tome 3, bk. 4, ch. 5). This battle took place on August 14-24, not on August 10, as O'Clery and the *Four Masters* say. O'Sullivan is not precise as to the date.

² *Four Masters*, vi. 2094-2102.

dénaidh ár n-olc-ne in méide go roichfidh leip do dénumh de, agus do-dénaim-ne bar n-olc-sa fá ár ndíthioll maille toil Dé.

Ag Cnoc Dupmaine, 6 *Februarii*, 1600.

O NEILL.

(*Translation*)

Our commendation to you, Mac Cochlan: we have received your letter, and what we understand thereby is that you do naught else but give fair words, and seek spinning out of time. For our part of the matter: whatsoever man shall not be with us, and will not spend for the right, we set it down that such man is a man against us. Wherefore, on every occasion in which you shall act for your own good, work you for our detriment, so much as ever you shall be able to compass of it; and we, on our side, will, by God's will, work you mischief to the uttermost of our power.

From Knockdufmayne,¹ *Feb.* 6, 1600.

O NEILL.

O Neill's journey to Munster terrified the whole province. He pitched his camp, about the beginning of March, at Inishcarra, between the Lee and the Bandon, in Co. Cork. There he received the submission of hosts of Mac Carthys, 'north and south' (Cormac, son of Diarmaid, lord of Muskerri, a staunch supporter of Queen Elizabeth, being an exception), of O Donohoes, O Donovans, and O Mahonys; and, add the Four Masters: 'he remained twenty days examining the disputes and covenants of the men of Munster, and reconciling them to each other in their contentions.'²

The great reverse of this expedition was Maguire's death. There are several accounts of this event, some

¹ This letter was captured by the English. A contemporary English translation anglicizes the name of the place from which O Neill wrote as above. *Cnoc Dubh-mhuine* would be an alternative way of spelling the Irish form. It means 'the Hill of the Dark Shrubbery.' The place can be identified. On Friday, Jan. 25 (Feb. 4, new style) O Neill entered Magawley's country, in Co. Westmeath. On Saturday he plundered Dillon's country in the neighbourhood, and on Sunday he rested at his original camp before proceeding on Monday, Feb. 7, to Durrow, a place which lies between Kilbeggan and Tullamore (*Cal. of State Papers*, 1600, 427). Magawley's country was the parish of Ballyloughloe or Calree; see my *Place-names of Westmeath*, 6. One of the townlands in this parish is now named Knockdomny. It lies close to the town of Moate. This is the place whence O Neill directed his ultimatum to MacCochlan. The original text and translation of the letter is here printed from Standish Hayes O'Grady's unpublished 'Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the British Museum.' 468.

² *Annals*, vi. 2160.

contemporary, others written long afterwards. The earliest are—(1) that of Sir Henry Power, one of the Commissioners for Munster, who was present at the affair, and described it in a letter to the Privy Council three days later; (2) a letter of William Meade, Mayor of Cork, directed to the same body on the same day, Tuesday, March 4-14; and (3) a joint letter of Sir Henry Power and Sir Warham Sentleger, his fellow-Commissioner, despatched after the death of the latter, also on March 4-14. Putting these accounts¹ together, we learn that O'Neill, with his forces, had been hovering around Cork for several days, and finally pitched his tent at Carrigrohane, not far distant from the city. Maguire, intending 'to spoil and burn the country,' led out a party of 45 horse and 16 shot, on Saturday, March 1-11. This force was engaged on the south side of the city by Power and Sentleger, leading a body of some fifty horse. The despatch of the former continues:—

I put towards them, and then the residue followed me; which Maguire perceiving, prepared himself for the encounter. At the first his shot did us some harm, and among the rest, killed one of my best horses with a bullet in the head. They being dispersed, I joined with the horse, and after some conflict, overthrew them. There were 32 of his horsemen slain, amongst whom Maguire made one; his foster-father, his priest, all the commanders of his regiment, and five or six of Tyrone's principal gentlemen died with him.

Power goes on to say that he himself dangerously wounded Maguire's eldest son. His companion, Sentleger, had engaged Maguire in single combat, being armed with a 'petronel charged with two bullets,' while the Irish chief carried only a lance. The dead body² of Maguire was recovered by O'Neill the next day, Sunday. By Tuesday Sentleger had succumbed to a dangerous wound in the skull. Maguire's son, unnamed in the accounts, also died from his injuries. The great chief was buried in Cork,

¹ *Cal. of State Papers*, 14, 15, 18.

² We gather from a letter of William Lyon, Bishop of Cork, that Maguire's death took place about a mile away from the scene of the engagement 'under a bush' (O Grady, *Catalogue*, 460). O Sullivan (tome 3, bk. 5, ch. 12) asserts that Maguire reached O'Neill's camp before his death, and that his horse, refusing to eat after the loss of its master, died of starvation.

according to O Clery,¹ and this statement is confirmed by a stanza in a poem written by Eochaidh O Heoghusa.²

There is a grandiloquent panegyric of Maguire in the Four Masters' work, at the point where they chronicle his death. This might possibly be discounted if we had not abundant records illustrating his career, or if enemy did not agree with friend in estimating the chief's character. But Sir John Davys corroborates the Irish view of Maguire's place among the men of his time; no words could be more eloquent than this lawyer's description of the ruler of Fermanagh as 'a valiant rebel.'

Maguire, like his father before him, was a generous patron of the poets. The pieces addressed to him would fill a fair-sized volume, and were written by Eochaidh O Heoghusa, of Ballyhosey, Co. Fermanagh, by Tadhg Dall O Huiginn, by Fearghal Og Mac an Bhaird, and by others, whose names were less prominent in that age. O Heoghusa had an estate under Maguire, and strange to say, managed to save it in the clearances of the Plantation of Ulster.

There are few details to be mentioned regarding Maguire's wife and children. The wife was a daughter (name unknown) of Tyrone, as already stated. The Irish treatise on the family, preserved in C.vi.1 and 23 K43, R.I.A., gives the sons' names, Sean Ruadh, Aodh, and Eamonn. We may credit the report that the eldest boy was slain on the same day as his father. Another must have been disposed of in some way by August 24, 1607, when the Earl of Clanricarde writes³ concerning Cuchonnacht Og Maguire, brother of Sir Hugh, 'is upon this occasion or some other gone out of Ireland, as Clanricarde hears, into

¹ *Life of Aodh Ruadh*, 228.

² 'Iomdha tír do thimchil sibh
a bratach Aodh Móg-uidhir
id thrömluighe gé taoi a-muigh
gach laoi id chomhnuidhe i gCorcaigh.'

'Many a district hast thou gone around, O flag of Aodh Maguidhir, though outside thou art lying every day at rest in Cork' (*Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, ii. 359).

³ To Salisbury, *Cal. of State Papers*, 253.

Spain. He meant that a brother of his should take the profit and protection of the country, and Clanricarde has heard . . . he had a particular regard unto the right of *his eldest brother's child*, being now very young, and by a daughter, as Clanricarde conceives, of Tirone.' This child was still in being in 1610, for Sir Arthur Chichester refers to him then as 'Tyrone's grandchild, son to Hugh Maguyre, slain in Munster.'¹ There is no further trace of him. There are two daughters of Maguidhir, named Rose and Margaret, referred to in a poem of Brian O Corcraín, written² about 1600. These may have been children of Hugh Maguire, but I rather fancy they were his sisters.

Strictly speaking, the name of chieftain should not be given to Cuchonnacht Maguire, the successor of Aodh. We shall see in a moment that the title of Maguidhir was bestowed upon him by Hugh Roe O Donnell, and he is spoken of in that style by more than one writer who understood the force of the appellation. But, so far as I know, there is no evidence that the ceremonies of inauguration were ever observed in his case. If we do allow him the title of chief, he is certainly the last to whom it may be legitimately applied.

We have seen that in 1589 Connor Roe Maguire had a strong claim to the highest honour associated with the name. Even then he was the *sinnsear* or senior member of the family eligible for nomination as chief. Consequently he was a thorn in the side of Aodh, the successful candidate, while the latter remained in power. In 1600 there was a vacancy again, and Connor and Cuchonnacht, the last chief's half-brother, were at once in evidence as claimants. Cuchonnacht was backed by Sir Arthur O Neill,³ his brother-in-law, then in favour with the English as an opponent of Tyrone. On the other hand, Tyrone favoured⁴ Connor Roe, who was his first cousin, they being the sons of two

¹ *Cal. of State Papers*, 56.

² Preserved in the Book of O Connor Don, f. 229.

³ *Cal. of State Papers*, 30.

⁴ *Ibid.* 92, 126; *Life of Aodh Ruadh*, p. 228.

sisters, children of Cuchonnacht the Coarb, † 1537. Cormac mac Baron, brother of Tyrone, pushed forward Cuchonnacht, who had married his daughter. If we may credit the *Life of Aodh Ruadh*, the deciding voice was that of the Tirconnell chief, who happened to be a cousin of Cuchonnacht.¹ In that document there is an exceedingly graphic description² of how O Donnell nominated his own selection, in opposition to the wishes and preference of O Neill. The result was war in Fermanagh, and Connor Roe, having had all his country in the south of the county plundered and burned, went over³ to the English side.

During the remaining stages of Tyrone's war Cuchonnacht remained his staunch ally. In the great expedition to Munster in the Winter of 1601-2 he led a considerable force. He and Cormac mac Baron are said to have lost nearly all their infantry at the battle of Kinsale,⁴ but the chiefs themselves reached the North in safety after that disastrous event. About the middle of 1602 Sir Henry Folliot was put in charge of the new fortress at Ballyshannon, with special instructions to detach Maguire from Tyrone, and to receive him to mercy, 'upon condition he would be content to have his country divided between Connor Roe and himself, and would deliver to her Majesty's use the castle of Enniskillen, with the ordnance therein.' A little later he was reported to have broken down his own stronghold, and to have accepted a protection, but in October we find 'he had lately abused the favour offered him by Sir Henry Folliot, governor of Ballyshannon.' Towards the close of the year he had joined Captain Tyrell and O Rourke in the latter's country.⁵

On December 31, 1602, Domhnall O Sullivan Beare set out on his memorable journey from Glengariff to

¹ Cuchonnacht was son of Margaret O Neill, daughter of Sean, son of Conn Bacach, son of Conn Mor; Aodh Ruadh's grandmother was Siobhan, daughter of the same Conn Mor.

² pp. 228-232 in Father Murphy's edition.

³ *Cal. of State Papers* (1600), 267, 331, 337.

⁴ *Ibid.* (1602) 284.

⁵ Fynes Moryson, iii. 180, 206, 224, 233, 237.

O Rourke's home in Leitrim. With the events of that astonishing march we are not here concerned ; but shortly after his arrival in Leitrim O Sullivan found an ally in Cuchonnacht Maguire, and the two chiefs, with three hundred armed men, set forth to visit the Earl of Tyrone, then in the extreme North, more than a hundred miles away, with a view to resuming the war. They had to pass through Fermanagh, which was at the time defended by Connor Roe's forces. Fortunately, Cuchonnacht and O Sullivan got over the ford of Belturbet before their opponents reached that place, and took up a position six miles away, on the other side. Connor Roe had left his camp in charge of fifty men when he set out to intercept the invading party. It was promptly occupied by Cuchonnacht and O Sullivan, and the defenders executed. Connor Roe¹ was thus drawn to an engagement, but his advance failed, in consequence of a stratagem adopted by the wily Domhnall. On the retreat Connor Roe rested for a night at Lios Ui Neill, a place of which Philip O Sullivan gives this interesting description : ' a deserted old fort, constructed of small stones, surrounded by a fosse, covered with tall trees at the edge, and known to the natives as " O Neill's Stronghold," because in it O Neill used to inaugurate Maguidhir.' This fortress gave name to the modern townland of Lisoneill, on which Lisnaskea town in part stands. Connor Roe and his men were subsequently engaged, and the leader, with two of his sons and some followers, with difficulty escaped to Lough Erne. The victors then proceeded on their journey to Glenconkene, only to discover that Tyrone had concluded peace. Maguire submitted on terms we shall discuss in a moment, but O Sullivan failed to recover a single acre of his estates and left Ireland for ever.²

The author we have just quoted states that Maguire

¹ Having destroyed the camp, O Sullivan posted his forces at a place named Alfarcán, ' a dense wood.' This place is now known as Altawark, and lies near the Monaghan border.

² O Sullivan, tome iii. bk. 3, ch. 1, 5.

made peace with the English on conditions identical with O'Neill's. The whole of Fermanagh had already been granted by patent¹ to Connor Roe Maguire; consequently, unless the latter was to waive all claims to lands in the country, some arrangement must be effected between him and Cuchonnacht. Connor Roe was induced to surrender his patent² on January 16, 1604, and a division of the country was made. Cuchonnacht secured the castle of Enniskillen, and all that part of the county which lies west of the Erne, plus the baronies of Lurg and Coole, on the opposite side; his rival got the rest, the three modern baronies of Tirkennedy, Magherastephana, and Clankelly.³ This settlement was made on the basis of instructions sent from England to the Irish Government, but patents were never made out for the grants.⁴ Cuchonnacht was dissatisfied with the arrangement from the start; and seeing that O'Neill and Rury O'Donnell, who were in possession of patents for Tyrone and Tirconnell, respectively, were having their claims daily diminished, he made up his mind to fly from the country altogether. He failed to get shipping in the Autumn of 1606, but about Whitsuntide following he was able to reach the court of the Archduke, at Brussels, purchased a ship⁵ at Rouen, and with it carried away the Northern nobles and their families from Lough Swilly on the Feast of the Exaltation of the Cross, September 14, 1607.

Cuchonnacht's movements on the Continent are faithfully described by one of his own followers, Tadhg O'Cianain.⁶ We need not give the details of them here.

¹ *Cal. of Patent Rolls*, Elizabeth, 584.

² The document of surrender is attached to Fiant of Elizabeth 6468.

³ *Cal. of State Papers* (1610), 575.

⁴ *Ireland Under Elizabeth and James I*, 347. On June 23, 1605, the Lord Deputy and Council stated they had passed Connor Roe's lands to him in accordance with the instructions (*Cal. of State Papers*, 296); but there is not a trace of such a patent in the published abstracts of the rolls of that year, and a letter of September 12, 1606, shows that Chichester refused to make other than a temporary settlement (*ibid.* 561).

⁵ *Ibid.* 1607, 358.

⁶ See my edition of Tadhg's book (Dublin, 1916), which I have named *The Flight of the Earls*.

Suffice it to say that, while on a journey from Rome to Spain, he died of fever at Genoa, on August 12, 1608. There exists a graceful poem on the sad event from the hand of Brian O Corcraín.¹

It has been already mentioned that Cuchonnacht married a daughter of Cormac mac Baron O'Neill. Nothing is known of his only son named Donnchadh.² After Cuchonnacht, the senior representative of his family was his brother Brian. About this latter a few paragraphs must now be added.

In 1811 a certain 'Brian Maguire, Esq., late an officer in the Hon. East India Company's native army in Bombay,' published a genealogy of the Maguires in a pamphlet,³ now very rare. This compilation is most unreliable, and unfortunately it misled John O'Donovan in his account of the last Maguire's representatives in his edition of the *Four Masters* (vi. 2366), who says Brian Maguire was a son of Cuchonnacht. There is clear evidence that he was his *brother*, not his son:—

1°. 'Being demanded whether he did write any letter from Couconagh to Brian his *brother*' (*Cal. of State Papers*, August 11, 1606, 566).

2°. 'I have delivered you a secret, and I do allow you, after seven or eight days, to impart the same to my *brother* Brian' (*ibid.*).

3°. 'His *brother* Brian Maguire' (*ibid.* 567).

4°. 'Brian Magwire, *brother* to the fugitive' (*ibid.* May 19, 1608, 525; see also *ibid.* 568).

5°. 'The other four baronies were intended to Cowconnought Maguyre, and are now in the hands of his *brother* Bryen. . . . Bryen is a proper and active young man, and has a younger brother' (*ibid.* Oct. 14, 1608, 56).

6°. 'Bryan Maguire *brother* to the traitor Coconnagh, and his other brother' (*ibid.*, undated, 365).

7°. We learn from a contemporary poem⁴ addressed to Brian that his mother's name was Margaret and it has been already shown that Cuchonnacht's mother was Margaret, daughter of Sean O'Neill.

Brian Maguire was one of the few of the native Irish that fared pretty well under the Plantation of Ulster. On April 30, 1610, Sir Arthur Chichester was instructed to

¹ The Book of O'Connor Don, f. 227.

² See the treatise on the Maguire pedigrees in 23 K45 and C.vi.1, R.I.A.

³ There is a copy in the Halliday collection, R.I.A., No. 992.

⁴ Published in *Studies*, June, 1921.

grant him one great proportion of land in the precinct of Coole and Tirkennedy, and a small one to his brother Turlough.¹ Both had patents passed to them a few months later, but when Pynnar executed his Survey in 1618-19, Turlough had died, and his estate had fallen to Brian.² The whole amounted to 2,500 acres and was called the manor of Tempo or Tempodeisel.

According to manuscript F.4.18, f. 107, Trinity College, Dublin, Brian married Susanna, daughter of Calvagh O Connor of Balintara (Ballintober?) in Co. Roscommon. He lived at Tullyweel in the parish of Enniskillen, and, like his brothers,³ was a patron of the learned. He died on April 24, 1655, and was succeeded by his grandson Cuchonnacht, who afterwards fell on the field of Aughrim.

PAUL WALSH.

¹ *Cal. of State Papers*, 441.

² Hill, *Plantation of Ulster*, 336, 492.

³ His cousin and namesake Brian, son of Connor Roe, Baron of Enniskillen, financed the Four Masters.

CATHOLICS AND EVOLUTION THEORIES

BY REV. H. V. GILL, S.J., M.A., M.Sc.

SOME time ago the present writer contributed a short article to this Review¹ on the 'Origin of Life.' He pointed out that there was too great a tendency to attach undue importance to the question of 'spontaneous generation.' He showed that, while a sound argument to prove the existence of God may be deduced from modern scientific views involving the negation of life coming from non-living matter, the great Scholastic philosophers had no difficulty at all in admitting the possibility—or even the fact—of spontaneous generation. Proofs of the existence of God, arising from such considerations, are of comparatively recent origin, and were unknown to the older writers, who relied for their proofs of the existence of God on other arguments, which are as sound to-day as they have ever been. While it is perfectly true that no case of spontaneous generation has ever been detected, or is ever likely to be, yet it is well to keep clearly in mind the fact that if some scientist were to-morrow to demonstrate the evolution of life from inorganic materials, it would make no difference at all to Catholics from a religious stand-point. The arguments, which were briefly touched on in the article referred to, have recently been set out with great clearness in a work which must claim the attention of all who follow the trend of modern thought.²

¹ December, 1913.

² 'Le Darwinisme au point de vue de l'Orthodoxie Catholique, par Henry de Dorlodot, Professeur de Géologie, Docteur en Théologie et en Sciences naturelles, Ancien Professeur de Théologie dogmatique au Séminaire de Namur, Professeur de Géologie et de Paléontologie stratigraphique à l'Université Catholique de Louvain, 1921.' The volume bears the *Imprimatur* of the Rector of Louvain University. The work will, no doubt, give rise to important discussion, and will have a considerable influence on Catholic philosophical teaching.

The problem of the origin of life on the earth may be considered from several points of view. The experimental scientist concerns himself primarily with the deductions to be drawn from the observation of natural phenomena, and tabulates facts or suggests theories according to the evidence he may have obtained. The Catholic theologian and the Catholic philosopher are concerned with the bearings of the question on the teachings of Revelation and the principles of sound reasoning. These three aspects are not water-tight compartments, and for the Catholic student are all of importance. He knows that there can be no conflict between natural science, philosophy, and theology, and that any true doctrine must satisfy the sound teachings of all three. The main thesis of the volume under consideration is to show that there is nothing in the Scriptures to forbid us to hold the doctrine of natural evolution, and that the writings of the Fathers incline strongly towards theories involving the evolution of life from non-living matter. The discussion of the origin of man is postponed to a future volume, which will be looked forward to with interest. The writer does not hesitate to express his views with great directness and presents the case in a strictly scientific spirit. Although the main feature of Darwin's theory is accepted, he does not agree with the details of Darwin's reasoning, though, did the teachings of scientific investigation permit, he would be prepared to go much further than Darwin, who, as will appear, was less 'advanced' in his views than SS. Basil, Gregory, and Augustine (!).

If then the theory of evolution can claim the support of the Fathers, how has it come about that all theories of evolution are regarded with such suspicion by so many modern Catholic philosophers? The reply to this question is essentially connected with the application of evolution to the origin of man, and does not concern us for the moment. Whatever be the reason, the author regrets that the result has been so detrimental to religion:—

But why then has it been possible to exploit Darwinism against religion with such force, but because there have been Catholic authors

who have compromised the Christian religion by falsely representing it as irreconcilable with scientific theories? And why has Darwinism kept certain scholars away from religion, except that, seeing clearly the truth of these theories, they have not thought it worth while to study the fundamentals of a religion which was represented to them as hostile to that which they knew to be true? In speaking thus, I have before my mind concrete examples; and I could cite examples of scientists, by no means the least, who have changed their attitude towards religion, because we have never been willing to accept the advice of the faint-hearted (p. 78).

The first of the two conferences, which with the Appendices, make up the volume, deals with the teaching of Genesis. The object of M. de Dorlodot is to show that, while the Scripture attributes to God the origin of all the species and well-defined varieties, it does not allow us to conclude that the apparition of species in the world is due to a special intervention of God. In a dissertation on the work 'of the Six Days,' the author expounds his views with great vigour. The primary object of the inspired writer was to bring out the great fact that God is the Creator of all things. The rest is a popular account of creation which is not to be taken as a scientific treatise, and which embodied the ordinary ideas of the people of the period. 'As you see, the Holy Spirit has neglected nothing to warn us that, following the expression of St. Augustine, *the exposition according to the order of the days has only the semblance of history.*' The examination of the author's treatment of this aspect of the question must be left to the consideration of exegetical scholars.

The main thesis of the second conference is that: 'The teaching of the Holy Fathers is very favourable to the *theory of natural absolute evolution.*' The author writes:—

Let me recall to mind that we call *theory of natural absolute evolution*, the theory which denies any *special intervention* of God, even with regard to the origin of life, and which thus attributes the first origin of living things to a natural evolution of inorganic matter, certain portions of which would have organized themselves, and become living by the mere action of the forces inherent in inorganic matter. Let me remind you that this theory is more radical than that of Darwin, since Darwin accepted the principle that the first origin of living things is due to a special intervention of the Creator who breathed life into one only, or into a small number of primitive forms (p. 81).

This is simply 'spontaneous generation.' Darwin's exact words are: 'There is grandeur in this view of life, with its several powers, having been breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one; and that whilst this planet has gone cycling on, according to a fixed law of gravity, from so simple a beginning, endless forms, most beautiful and most wonderful, have been and are being evolved.'¹ Although afterwards Darwin inclined to agnosticism, he never altered these words in the later editions of his work.

While the conclusions to be drawn from the Scriptures are negative, the author finds in the teachings of the Fathers positive evidence that they favoured what we should call to-day an advanced theory of natural evolution. He tells us that an exhaustive study of the Fathers of the first eight centuries justifies *him in saying that 'the Fathers who have treated this subject ex professo are unanimous in recognizing no special intervention of God for the formation of the world, beyond the creative action by which God drew the world from nothing, at the origin of time'* (p. 83.)

The teaching of St. Basil (331-379) is best studied in the writings of his brother, St. Gregory of Nyssa, who tells us that he teaches nothing which is contrary to his brother's views on the formation of the world. Special stress is laid on the following passage, which our author examines closely in its original Greek.

Thus in telling us at the beginning of his cosmogony that God created heaven and earth, Moses suggests to us (en résumé) that God produced (or to translate more literally: that God projected, or shot out) in an instant, the *origins* (principles), the *causes*, the *potentialities* of all things, and that under the first impulse of His volition, the essences of all things emerged; heaven, ether, the stars, fire, air, sea, land, *animals*, *plants*, all seen by the eye of God, and manifested in accordance with His power, who, as the prophet says, 'sees all things before they are' (p. 92).

Special attention is called to the enumeration of animals and plants. St. Gregory continues:—

From this projection of Power and Wisdom towards the completion of each one of the parts of the world, there was bound to result a necessary

¹ *Origin of Species*, 6th ed. vol ii. p. 305, 1888.

succession, according to a determined order ; so that first of all came fire, and appeared before the other visible things of the universe ; in the same way after it came that which had to follow it necessarily, and then a third, in the way that a nature artistically constructed would demand (ὡς ἡ τεχνικὴ σμυρνάγκαζε φύσις), then a fourth and a fifth, and the rest appearing in the same orderly fashion, and not as the result of chance springing from unordered and fortuitous motion (p. 93).

We are asked to see in this ' artistic nature ' the workings of an initial unique impulse (μία ῥοπή) given once for all by the Divine Wisdom, who would then, through the ordinary exercise of His directing power, co-operate with nature in its evolution.

Space does not allow us to deal with the examination of the teachings of St. Augustine (354-430), but the following passage represents his views :—

In this little seed there existed a more wonderful and more powerful potentiality which has transformed the water mixed with earth into the nature of this tree, with its branches, the shape and verdure of its leaves, the form and magnificence of its fruits, and the special organization of each one of its parts. And what is there which grows on or hangs from this tree which has not its source in the mysterious treasury of the seed ? . . . But just as in the seed, there was found united, in an invisible manner, all that was to develop with time into a tree ; so we must represent to ourselves that the world at the moment when God created all things at once contained, simultaneously, all things ; that is to say, not only the heavens with the sun, the moon, and the stars, whose nature persists in the course of their revolutions, and the earth and the seas, which are subject to irregular movements ; but also the things which the earth has produced, potentially and in causality, before they developed in time as we know them (p. 103).¹

This passage explains the meaning to the theory which he proposed in the form of a question :

Did the works enumerated in the Hexameron appear instantly, or were they produced successively, or again, if we see anything fulfil in time that which its nature demands, did this come from these innate qualities which God implanted, as in a germ, in the very act of creation itself ? (*De Genesi ad litteram*, bk. iv. ch. 33, ' ex illis insitis rationibus, quas, tanquam seminaliter sparsit Deus in ictu condendi, cum dixit et facta sunt ') (p. 102).

From such considerations the author concludes that the

¹ *De Genesi ad litteram*, bk. v., ch. 23.

teaching of the Fathers is that every natural perfection which did not exist *actually* at the instant of creation existed *virtually*, and appeared later by *natural evolution without any special intervention of God*. Much as he would desire to be able to accept this doctrine, he finds himself obliged to admit the truth of the more modern attitude which has developed from the views held by the great Scholastic doctors, who limited spontaneous generation to the lower forms of life. Even they went further than modern science would warrant, since all the evidence we have goes to show that *no form of life* proceeds from non-living constituents :—

The Aristotelian Scholastics, for reasons of a scientific order, have generally applied the theory of natural absolute evolution only to a certain portion of living things ; but all the doctors have remained faithful to the doctrine of *christian naturalism*. So long as we remain faithful to this spirit it is also lawful for us—at least provisionally—to hold a less radical solution than natural absolute evolution, if the present state of scientific knowledge counsels such a course (p. 108).

This ‘christian naturalism’ is the application of the doctrine of secondary causes :—

Under the name of christian naturalism I understand the tendency to attribute to the natural action of secondary causes all that which reason and the positive results of experimental sciences do not forbid us so to attribute, and not to have recourse to a special intervention of God, distinct from the general acts of His government, except in the case of absolute necessity (p. 115).

Evidently the truth of any theory of evolution is a matter for scientific investigation. We are not concerned with this question for the moment. That the author is a convinced evolutionist is evident. He presents his views with great force, and frankly regrets that he cannot go the whole way with the Fathers, and that he is obliged to accept a theory as mild as that indicated by Darwin’s general principle. For him the power and wisdom of God appear more imposing when we suppose the Creator to have created at once those potentialities in the beginning, which in the course of ages would develop by natural processes

into the marvellous variety and beauty which we see around us :—

Are we then justified in taking the final step, and, following the teachings of these great Doctors, accept the theory of *absolute evolution*? Would I could reply in the affirmative. But in the first place, nothing in the actual phenomena of nature justifies us in doing so. In spite of the most diligent search, it has been impossible to discover any passage or intermediate state between dead matter and the living cell. Again, the fundamental laws of life are opposed to those of inert matter: this latter, left to itself, tends towards simple and stable arrangements, while life tends towards arrangements which are complex and relatively unstable. Finally, in inorganic matter each element works for itself and tends towards its own end. It does not then seem possible that dead matter can be the seat of *natural powers* tending towards the formation of a being really one and *organized*, whose various parts would have the faculty of *directing their action essentially towards the common end of the whole*.

But would I were mistaken; and I shall bless whoever will show me how I may abandon Darwin, to follow, on this point, Augustine and Gregory (p. 151).

The importance attached in popular esteem to any statement suggesting the production of life from non-living material is an evidence of the widespread conviction that the fact of life is an eloquent testimony to the existence and power of the Creator. There is, perhaps, no argument which carries with it greater conviction than that furnished by the impossibility of accounting for the beginnings of life in the universe, except by postulating the special intervention of a being capable of producing life from non-life. We are certainly justified in insisting on the force of this argument, but it would clearly be a mistake to insist too strongly on this proof of the existence of God to the exclusion of other sound proofs. One evil effect of this undue insistence would be to alienate those who might be influenced by other arguments, but who refuse to admit the force of this argument. For there are sincere investigators who, however mistaken we may think them, are not without hope that some day their efforts to produce life in the laboratory will be crowned by success. If then we insist unduly on a proof which seems to them scientifically unsound, we naturally prejudice them towards the conclusion

we wish them to arrive at. The scientific attitude is to maintain that while no trace of spontaneous generation has ever been found, and while we are strongly justified from our knowledge of the differences between living and non-living things in concluding that it never will be found, yet, were spontaneous generation to be discovered it would not in the least weaken our position. It is quite possible that by insisting too strongly on this argument the Catholic position has not been presented with its full force.

On the other hand evolutionists have gone to the opposite extreme and have represented as a scientific fact what is nothing more than a theory. An example of this is to be found in a sermon preached at the British Association Meeting of 1920, by the Rev. E. M. W. Barnes, F.R.S., Canon of Westminster. This sermon had the unique distinction of being reprinted in full in *Nature* (vol. 106, September 2, 1920). The preacher stated, no doubt, that 'Evolution was, and still is, not an observed fact, but a very probable theory.' But his treatment of the subject is such that the casual reader would accept as definite statements what are merely opinions. He goes on to say:—

Evolution seemed disastrous to faith two generations ago, because men fixed their attention narrowly on but one part of the process. Now a wider vista seems to be coming into view, as theories are tested by experiment and unified by speculative reason. From some fundamental stuff in the universe electrons arose. From them came matter, from matter life emerged. From life came mind. From mind spiritual consciousness developed. At every stage, in this vast process and progress, something new has come, we know not how, into existence. There was a time when matter, life, mind, the soul of man were not; but now they are. Each has arisen as part of a vast scheme planned by God. And the soul of man is the glory of the whole design.

Each one of the statements included in this passage is merely an opinion, and whatever evidence there may be for supposing the evolution of chemical elements, there is not a tittle of direct scientific evidence for the rest. Yet a casual hearer of statements advanced by one who claims to be a serious scientist would naturally accept them as representing established facts. Such methods do not

really help religion, and though, with the exception of certain statements concerning the value of the Scriptures, we would endorse much of what the preacher expressed very beautifully concerning God's place in His universe, we must regard the whole sermon as unscientific.

It is this abuse of science which has given rise in the minds of not a few Catholics to a suspicion that the boasted achievements of science hide an irreligious purpose, and they commit perhaps a greater fault in shutting their eyes to the wonders of God's creation. The Christian standpoint is that through all the workings of nature God's wisdom, power, and goodness shine out and speak with eloquence of their Lord and Maker. All Scripture invites us to praise God in His works. In Genesis God Himself saw that what He had made 'was good,' nay 'very good.' The Book of Job is a hymn of praise of the Creator : 'Stand and consider the wondrous works of God' (xxxvii. 14). The Psalms (e.g., ciii.) breathe the same spirit. The Book of Wisdom calls those who are blind to the lesson to be read in nature inexcusable :—

But all men are vain in whom there is not the knowledge of God ; and who, by these good works that are seen, could not understand him who is, neither by attending to the works have acknowledged who was the workman : But have imagined either the fire, or the wind, or the swift air, or the circle of the stars, or the great water, or the sun and moon, to be the gods that rule the world. With whose beauty if they being delighted, took them to be gods : let them know how much the Lord of them is more beautiful than they : for the first author of beauty made all these things. Or if they admired their power and their effects, let them understand by them, that he that made them is mightier than they. For by the greatness of the beauty, and of the creature, the creator of them may be seen so as to be known thereby (xiii. 1-5).

So, too, St. Paul :—

For the invisible things of him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made ; his eternal power also, and divinity : so that they are inexcusable (Rom. i. 20).

Following the teaching of the Scriptures and Catholic philosophy, ascetic writers have made use of these truths in their exhortations to the love of God. St. Ignatius, in the concluding 'Exercise,' asks us to consider in the first

place that we owe all things to the generosity of God. He goes on :—

The second point is to consider how God dwells in creatures, in the elements giving them being, in the plants giving them growth, in animals giving them feeling, and in man giving them understanding, and so in me, giving me being, life, feeling, and causing me to understand. . . . The third point is to consider how God works and labours for me in all created things on the face of the earth, that is *habet se ad modum laborantis*, as in the heavens, plants, fruit, cattle, etc., giving them being, preserving them, giving them growth and feeling, etc. . . . The fourth point is to see how all good things and all gifts descend from above, as my limited power from the Supreme and Infinite Might on high, and in the same way, justice, goodness, pity, mercy, etc., just as the rays descend from the sun, and the waters from the spring.

That ‘from an interior knowledge of the many and great benefits I have received, being thoroughly grateful, I may in all things love and serve His Divine Majesty.’

There is, perhaps, some evidence that a process of evolution is at work in the inorganic world, but there is none to enable us to bridge over the gap between living and non-living matter. The discovery of the radio-active elements have enabled scientists to form attractive theories of the transformation of uranium into radium and of radium into helium. These theories are based on experimental evidence which points to such a conclusion, but it would certainly be premature to make any definite assertion that the case has been proved. For example, it is beyond doubt that the α -rays from radium are positively charged nuclei of helium gas. But it is possible that radium, in some way not yet fully understood, may have simply absorbed helium already existing, just as certain other metals seem to contain an inexhaustible supply of hydrogen. Platinum, for example, when heated, seems to give off a continuous, though small, supply of hydrogen, no matter how long we may heat it. Then, again, certain results of modern research seem to support the view that all matter is constituted from some one or two primitive constituents. The ‘electron,’ for example, is common to every kind of matter, and as far as the evidence goes, is absolutely identical in its properties, no matter from what kind of matter it

has been separated. We know with considerable certitude that atoms consist of positive nuclei associated with one or more negative electrons. Certain recent researches have led to theories which are based on the view that the nuclei of the different kinds of atoms are built up of some common elementary nuclei, identical in every atom, connected and bound together by electrons. This common nucleus is probably the positively charged nucleus of the atom of hydrogen.

To this extent there may be said to be some evidence pointing to an evolution in the inorganic world, but the evidence is very slight, and certainly does not warrant any definite assertion. There is no evidence at all that non-living matter can ever, through the ordinary processes of nature, become living matter. We are not concerned here with the biological problem of the origin of species or the evolution of living things, whether they all developed from one or from a few forms, or whether they were created separately. Nor can we deal with the origin of man and his soul. No doubt when M. de Dorlodot fulfils his promise to deal with this question he will present his views with the same force and clearness which he has displayed in the work which we have been considering.

H. V. GILL, S.J.

SOME CELEBRATED IRISH ARTISTS

By REV. E. A. FORAN, O.S.A.

DURING the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries a number of Irishmen migrated to the British Capital, where, in the environment of social power and wealth, they worked their way to fame and left the impress of their native genius upon English Literature and Art. The honours which they have won may be claimed by their Motherland, and in their achievements their countrymen should feel a natural pride. In the Poet's Corner in Westminster there is an array of memorials which should arrest the Irish pilgrim's steps and stir his mind to reflections of pleasure. Across the way from the venerable Abbey rises that wondrous 'dream in stone,' the Parliament House, the most superb Gothic structure of its kind in the world. It is the creation of an Irish architect, Charles Barry, and within its walls the supreme works of painting and sculpture are the productions of Irish artists. In the sombre crypt of St. Paul's Cathedral, a place reserved with exclusive sacredness as the resting place of the greatest representatives of British Art, there are slabs and brasses that tell us that the dust of Irishmen lies beneath.

The object of this paper is to awake some echo of the memory of those artists who, like so many of their countrymen, drifting upon the waves of fortune, to find an exile's home and grave in other lands, came to England with no other recommendation than the gifted pencil, and with no other hope of success than that inspired by the consciousness of their own great powers, and who, despite the prejudices of a people intensely hostile to Irish aspirations, worked their way into the front ranks of the pioneers of British Art and became closely identified with

the establishment of the National School of British Painting and Sculpture.

No serious national effort was made in England in the domain of a national art until the last decades of the eighteenth century. A coterie of artists under Hogarth founded an academy of life study, but their efforts met with scant encouragement, and the result was insignificant. Hogarth and Reynolds were the leading painters of this period, but Hogarth estranged popular feeling by his satire, whilst Reynolds painted for opulence rather than fame. Under these circumstances the spirit of the association, founded by Hogarth, passed with him to the grave. But it was revived again a few years after his death in the birth of the Royal Academy (1768).

Amongst the men who made it possible to bring the Royal Academy into being, and who contributed more to ensure its vitality than any other artists of the time, were Edmund Garvey, Nathaniel Hone, George Barrett, Francis Cotes, and Henry Tresham, all artists of exceptional ability; and later, Barry, Copley, Shee, Mulready, Maclise, Macdowell, Elmore, Foley, Collins, and Stanfield—all Irish artists. Reynolds was invited to become the first President of the new institution, but he looked upon the movement instituted by his brother-artists with indifference and disapproval. He had attained a position of opulence in his portraiture that satisfied his artistic ambitions, and it was only when that great Irishman, Edmund Burke, flattered his vanity with the suggestion that the Presidency brought the promise of a knighthood, that he could be induced to accept the position.

Up to this time English Art had found little of that encouragement from Church or State in which the advanced schools of other countries had been fostered. Foreign artists had always held the first place in popularity with the reigning monarchs and society, and English painting, with the exception of Hogarth's marvellous works, was but the disappointing shadow of the might have been. The new institution brought the dawn of a new era and a

change in popular taste which gradually developed into enthusiastic encouragement of native talent. An English School of Art received the promise of success.

The Irish element was well represented at the first and successive exhibitions of the Academy, and, besides those already mentioned as associated with the inauguration of the new era of art, there were several Irish artists whose works amongst the annual exhibits came up to the very highest standard of excellence. Irishmen had the honour of seeing one of their circle, Martin Archer Shee, elected fourth President of the Academy. The same dignity was offered to another Irishman, later, Daniel Maclise, but he declined to accept it.

One of the most remarkable figures in the history of this period of English Art was James Barry (1741-1806). He was born on the Quays, Cork, in October, 1741. He showed an extraordinary love for drawing in his boyhood, but his father, a rough uncultured individual, fearing lest the lad's career might be endangered by the indulgence of what he considered a useless hobby, took him from school and placed him on his vessel as a cabin boy. After a few voyages his mother secured his release and sent him to a school conducted by a priest in the city. Here he found such encouragement and help that his talent developed into a passion. When he was seventeen years of age he was sent, on the priest's advice, to the school of the Dublin Society of Arts. Six years later, at an exhibition held in Dublin for the encouragement of manufacture, commerce, and art, young Barry exhibited an historical picture, 'The Baptism of the King of Cashel,' a work which won for the artist the admiration and friendship of Edmund Burke, through whose influence the picture was purchased for the Irish Parliament House. In Barry, Edmund Burke recognized the soul of a great artist, and, in that noble and generous spirit for which he was so universally admired, he took the young man under his care, bestowed upon him an annuity, and sent him to Italy for four years. Barry developed his style on the great

masters of the Roman and Venetian Schools, and displayed an ambition to follow Titian and Michael Angelo.

In 1770 he returned to London, and, in the following year, in recognition of his ability, he was elected Associate of the Royal Academy. A few years later he became an Academician and was appointed professor of painting at the Academy Schools.

Barry's annual exhibits at the Academy excited intense public interest, and he was lauded as the leading master of the new British School. His works showed the indication of an original style which aroused the emulation of Reynolds, and found imitators in a host of enthusiasts, amongst whom were Fuseli, West, and Shee.

The first building erected for the Royal Academy was the old Adelphi Gallery in John Street, near the Strand. Barry decorated the Council Chamber of this building with a series of remarkable paintings, two of which are forty-two feet long by twelve feet high. The first of the series represents man in a semi-savage state ; the second represents the Grecian harvest home, where Bacchus and Ceres are being honoured ; the third, which is one of the larger canvasses, represents the Olympian victories ; the fourth is called the Invocation of the triumph of the Thames ; the fifth represents the distribution of awards to the Society of Arts ; the sixth represents Elysium, into which the artist introduced a group of men, famous in different lands and ages. These paintings, which occupied several years of study and labour, have been classed among the great masterpieces of the world's art. Canova, the famous Italian sculptor, on viewing those colossal productions of Irish genius, was heard to say that he would have willingly made the journey from Italy for the purpose alone of seeing them.

Barry had a profound contempt for the mere portrait painters of the day, and it was with the greatest reluctance that he finished the portrait of his friend and benefactor, Edmund Burke, which now hangs in the Irish National Gallery. He spoke of Reynolds as one content with the

lowest walks of art, because he continued to work as a portrait painter. Barry sought after the loftiest ideals. His conceptions were poetic and classical. His style was massive and bold; his drawing unique. He was held by connoisseurs of his day as the Michael Angelo of British Art. He died in February, 1806, and was buried in the crypt of St. Paul's.

Martin Archer Shee (1769–1850), another great representative of Ireland in British Art, was born in Dublin in December, 1769. He came to London, a poor orphan boy, where he sought out Edmund Burke, the unfailing friend of Irishmen in the great Metropolis. Burke took his hand affectionately in his, while he 'expatiated upon the claims and the glories of art.' Shee had an introduction to Barry, but that great enthusiast, on perceiving that the young artist had made a reputation in his native city in crayon portraiture, received him with coldness and discouragement. Edmund Burke sent young Shee to Reynolds, who gave him a more sympathetic reception and recommended him to enter the Academy Schools. Shee studied Barry's works very closely and adopted his style and methods, though he has not left us any classical or historical work of interest. In order to secure a livelihood he had to confine himself to portraiture, a style of art which secured him an extensive patronage. Ten years after his arrival in London he had won celebrity, and was elected an Associate of the Royal Academy, and two years later he became an Academician. He was elected to fill Barry's place, who withdrew from the Association at this time. Some say that he was expelled, but the fact is that the great master could not stand the degeneracy which was making its appearance in art, and, in the most caustic terms, he denounced the whole Academy, sparing nobody, from the student to the President. Shee's greatest forte was in portraiture, hence his works are scattered amongst the private collections of England. During his time he exhibited over three hundred paintings at the Academy. He was chosen President in 1830, and was knighted in the

same year. On his death, in August, 1850, arrangements were made for a public funeral and for his interment in the crypt of St. Paul's, but his family declined the honour and laid him to rest in the Dyke Road cemetery, Brighton.

Daniel Maclise and William Mulready, two other great Irish artists, had more of the native fire and independent brush of Barry, and their works will perpetuate their fame. Mulready (1786-1863) was born in Ennis in December, 1786. His parents migrated to London when he was quite a little boy. They settled in Soho, where they sent the lad to school to an aged Irish priest. It is said that one day an artist, whose name is unknown to us, found the boy drawing excellent pictures of his companions on the dead wall of the school. He took an interest in his career and had him placed as a student in the Academy Schools.

Mulready made remarkable progress under tuition and developed quite a distinct and original style, and his very first exhibits at the Royal Academy made his reputation as an artist of the highest ability. He became an Academician and professor at the life school of the Academy, honours of which only the greatest artist can aspire.

Mulready sought for his themes and his models in the lowly walks of life. It is said that when a boy he was given to fun, fighting and mischief, and it is remarkable that a great number of his paintings are descriptive of the pathos and humour of child-life. The power to give expression and to make the picture tell its story was the greatest characteristic of his genius. This is to be seen at a glance in his paintings. In his picture, 'The Fight Interrupted,' and 'Giving a Bite,' we have splendid portrayal of boy character. Mulready produced a great number of pictures, seventy-eight of which were exhibited at the Royal Academy. In 1848 two hundred and fourteen of his works were exhibited by the London Society of Arts. Fifteen of his pictures are in the South Kensington Gallery. In a picture called 'The Child-Sitter,' he has left us a portrait of himself, in the artist. His death occurred in 1863. His grave is in Kensal Green.

Daniel Maclise (1811–1870), who stands supreme amongst the artists of his day, was born in Cork, in January, 1811. His father was a descendant of a Scotch refugee ; his mother a Bandon lady. He made his first studies in the art school of his native city, which had just been enriched by a gift of statues, bequeathed to England by Pope Pius VII. Having acquired some repute through a portrait which he made of Sir Walter Scott during his visit to the City by the Lee, he took up portrait painting as a career. At the age of sixteen he left his Irish home to try his fortunes in London. Here he found friends amongst the Irish artists, through whose influence he gained admission to the Academy Schools. During two successive years he gained the medals for modelling and design, and in his third year he won the highest distinction of the School, the gold medal which carried with it a travelling scholarship. It is said that he declined the scholarship, and decided to remain in London at work on his first Academy picture, ‘A Scene from Twelfth Night.’

Maclise exhibited every year after this, the attention attracted by his paintings showing that he was steadily rising to fame. All this time he was studying Barry’s great paintings at the Adelphi, in which his keen eye saw all the excellences of the colour and technique of the Italian School. He followed Barry’s style, and from Barry he caught his inspiration to follow the noble ideals of Classical and Historical painting. In 1833, he exhibited his ‘Mokanna Unveiling his Face to Zelica,’ a picture which revealed his great imaginative power, and in 1842 he painted a picture which is considered to be one of his masterpieces, ‘A Scene from Hamlet.’ Three years later, when the Commissioners of Arts solicited designs from the leading artists of the day for the decoration of the Parliament Houses, Maclise’s designs were accepted, and he was commissioned to paint the two beautiful pictures over the stranger’s gallery in the gilded chamber. One represents the ‘Spirit of Chivalry,’ and the other the ‘Spirit of Justice.’ On the completion of these he painted the two colossal

pictures in the great hall leading from the Commons to the Lords, one of which represents 'The Death of Nelson,' and the other, 'The Meeting of Wellington and Blucher.' These are truly wonderful pictures, and are amongst the noblest monuments to Irish genius in the Metropolis. They are frescoes measuring forty-five feet by twelve, and took eight years to execute. The work met with some carping criticism from disappointed artists who found fault with his treatment of the subjects rather than with his artistic abilities, but his most celebrated successor in fresco painting, Ford Madox Brown, pays an honest tribute to his genius, when he compares him to the great artists, Michael Angelo, Titian and Raphael. 'In no modern school,' he says 'can such magnificence of design carried out with such faultless execution of colour be seen.'

Maclise was elected a member of the Royal Academy when he was only twenty-nine years of age. He was offered the Presidency but he did not accept it. Two of his magnificent Irish historical paintings are 'The Marriage of Strongbow and Eva,' and 'The Fallen Earl of Desmond on the Necks of the Butlers.' Maclise died in April, 1870, and is buried at Kensal Green.

Another Irish artist, whose works in sculpture are unequalled and unsurpassed by any master of the modern British School, is John Henry Foley (1818-1874). He was born in Dublin in May, 1818. He spent his early years in the Irish Capital, where in the Art School of the Royal Society he received his first lessons in modelling and design. During those years the mother country had but little to offer, and many of her gifted children drifted into exile. The great Metropolis became the objective of some who have become famous in literature, science, and art. Foley drifted with the crowd to London when he was only sixteen years of age, and embarked on the career of a sculptor. He found friends and sympathisers in the Irish artistic circles there, but he had to battle with adverse circumstances for ten years before his powers as an artist made any impression upon the public mind.

In 1844 the cloud lifted from his fortunes. In that year he exhibited 'Youth at the Stream,' a work in marble, of graceful and masterly execution, which placed him at once amongst the celebrities of British Art. It was this work that brought him under the notice of the committee entrusted with the decoration of the Parliament Houses, who commissioned him to execute two large statues for the hall of St. Stephen's of 'Hampden' and 'Selden.' These two figures, when completed, gave Foley the place of supremacy in his art. They are magnificent statues, especially that of Hampden, which stands out with an arresting beauty amongst the group of figures that line the hall. It is said to be as instinct with life and vigour as any of the works of Bernini or Michael Angelo. His next important commission was the equestrian statue of Lord Hardinge for the Indian Government. When this statue, which is said to be unequalled in equestrian statuary, was complete, London artists went into raptures of delight, and a move was made to retain it for the country. Henceforth Foley's career was a prosperous one, and he had more orders than he could execute for many years. He was engaged on the Albert Memorial, and although that is a much depreciated monument on the whole, Foley's statue of the Prince and his symbolical group, 'Asia,' are worthy of close inspection. Goldsmith's and Burke's statues, outside Trinity College, Grattan in College Green, the Gough memorial in Phoenix Park, the O'Connell statue in O'Connell Street, the Father Mathew statue in Cork, are all excellent specimens of this great sculptor's work, while the wonderfully beautiful figure of the young Irish officer, Fitzgibbon, on the Bridge in Limerick, is looked upon as having no equal in the kingdom. The artist himself considered that Goldsmith in College Green was his greatest work and, as a patriot, he felt the deepest pleasure to know that it was treasured and admired in his native city. Foley died in London in August, 1874, and was buried in the crypt of St. Paul's.

In a short article it would not be possible to do more

than to revive the memory of those men who left the stamp of their gifted genius upon a century of British Art. It would be difficult, too, to make even a review of all their masterpieces, so widely are they scattered among the private collections of the Kingdom. But we can judge of the excellence and merits of their art from the paintings that are to be seen in public collections of London. In the Diploma Gallery, where there is a permanent collection of the works of the leading masters of two centuries who gained the high distinction of the Royal Academy, we can see the 'Woodranger' of Maclise; Copley's 'Tribute Money'; Mulready's 'Village Buffoon'; Elmore's 'Two Gentlemen of Verona'; Peter's 'Children'; Collins' 'Angler'; Stanfield's and Garvey's 'Views'; Tresham's 'Death of Virginia'; Shee's 'Belisarius'; beautiful portraits by Shee, Hone, and Cotes; and Macdowell's statue of 'A Nymph,' and Foley's statue of 'The Young Brother.' In the South Kensington Museum there are thirteen of Mulready's paintings; several delightful sea views by Stanfield, and a number of other beautiful canvasses by O'Connor, Rothwell, Collins, Maclise, and Barry's portrait of himself. There were several other prominent Irish artists, whose names are not mentioned here, and whose works are rarely seen in public collections.

A visit to the Galleries of London should not fail to awaken a sense of pride and pleasure in the heart of the Irish art lover. With every Irish art lover I shall share the hope that, under the new conditions, there will be a brighter era for Art in Ireland, in which Irish effort shall find encouragement, and Irish genius an opportunity to build up a National School of Sculpture and Painting.

E. A. FORAN, O.S.A.

NOTES AND QUERIES

THEOLOGY

A RECENT REPLY

REV. DEAR SIR,—I agree with your solution in this month's I. E. RECORD¹ of 'Queenslander's' enquiry regarding the obligation of assisting at Mass. I do not, however, agree with some of the terminology. You state that 'our primary obligations do not come to an end when, through our own fault, or otherwise, our secondary duties have become impossible. "Queenslander's" friend is, therefore, bound *sub gravi* to remain.'

I distinguish: 'Queenslander's' friend is bound *sub gravi* to remain, if otherwise than through his own fault he is late for the Offertory. If, as supposed, he culpably arrives late, he is not bound *sub gravi* to remain. Obviously the more he omits the more grievous is the one sin he commits. Bound *sub gravi* means that if he does not remain he commits a grave sin. He has already committed a grave sin by being late for the Offertory. Therefore he would be guilty of two grave sins, apart from the possible changing of his intentions.

A cleric who culpably decides on omitting the whole of the Divine Office is not bound *sub gravi* to each hour which is a notable part. He is bound *sub gravi* to each notable part only when he is lawfully exempted from the remainder. The same is true of the precept of hearing Mass. Negative precepts do not serve as good examples to illustrate positive precepts.

LOGOTARIUS.

'Logotarius' has made no mistake in selecting his name. We admire his skill in the battle of words, without of course taking any more serious view of it than he does himself.

It is difficult to give a full reply to a query like 'Queenslander's' without exposing oneself to the danger of verbal criticism. We found it so at the time. And so will 'Logotarius,' if, instead of 'flinging' a few words, he tries to fling them all. Let him just follow out his own theory. He objects to the statement that the man 'is bound *sub gravi* to remain.' He is careful not to state whether he is bound *sub levi*. But surely that at least must be conceded. 'Obviously (he states) the more he omits the more grievous is the one sin he commits.' There is, therefore, an additional malice: and everyone is bound, at least *sub levi*, to avoid an additional malice. We may, therefore, take up the more dangerous-looking words he has thrown at us, and throw them back again. 'Bound

sub levi means that if he does not remain he commits a venial sin. He has already committed a grave sin by being late for the Offertory. Therefore he would be guilty of two sins—one grave and one venial—apart from the possible changing of his intentions.' Which 'Logotarius'—who 'agrees with our solution'—cannot possibly admit.

In our opinion, it would lessen confusion in these matters if the 'external' morality of acts were kept in view as well as the 'internal.' When we say that a man is bound *sub gravi*, we mean that he is bound to do or omit something that, in the eyes of a moral theologian, constitutes grave matter. 'Logotarius' will not agree with the definition, but we cannot help it. We think that a cleric is bound *sub gravi* to each notable portion of his Office, whether he has said the others or not. When a man owes, say, six times the amount that constitutes grave matter in the sphere of justice, he is bound, we think, *sub gravi* to discharge each portion of the debt—and the best proof we can offer is that, when he has attended to five, his obligation in regard to the sixth will still be grave. The essential part of the Mass is the part that was there from the beginning: it seems strange to talk of a man's obligation in regard to it being lessened because he has decided to omit portions introduced at a later date. And, of course, all that without prejudice to our view that the man who says no Office, makes no restitution, is absent from the whole Mass, may have committed only one sin.

And we think common sense supports us. If two individuals come late to Mass, one culpable the other not, the average man would be puzzled to hear that the more guilty was under less obligation to remain. So of two priests of whom one has said half his Office, the other decided to say none at all: their obligations in regard to the second half do not seem to be essentially different. And let us suppose, in the restitution case, that A and B each owe C twenty pounds, that each shows him a five-pound note and a fifteen, that A hands over the smaller note, and that they both then declare they will keep what they have. If C could smile at all, he would smile at the idea that B's guilt in regard to the fifteen pound note is less than A's.

Since 'Logotarius' is so severe on negative precepts, we will take the positive one he cites—that of saying the Divine Office. And he will allow us to ask him this: If a cleric culpably makes it impossible for himself to say one-half of the Office, is he bound *sub gravi* to say the other? If he is, 'Logotarius' case is at an end.

COMMUTATION OF VOWS

REV. DEAR SIR,—In common with many priests, I have for years enjoyed the power of commuting certain vows, but not of dispensing in them. Perhaps I should not speak of it as an enjoyment, for it has given me more trouble than pleasure at times. But I use the accepted term.

In the books within my reach I am told that the power mentioned should only be used for commuting a vow into another

‘equally good.’ But how am I to decide whether two things, in totally different departments, are exactly equal or not? One man has made a vow to go to confession every week, and he now wants to substitute greater regularity in almsgiving. Another has vowed a weekly fast, and he says now he would rather say the Rosary daily. And so on. Is there any kind of theological balance delicate enough to decide whether these things are precisely equivalent or not? Or has there been any decree on the matter in recent times?

CONFESSARIUS.

We think that the limited power described by ‘Confessarius’ will be granted very rarely to priests for the future. It seems to be quietly ignored by the Code, which states, for instance, that ‘a work promised by non-reserved vow may be commuted into a better or equally good by the person himself who has taken the vow; into one less good by the person who has power to *dispense*’ (1314). That, however, makes little difference as regards the principles involved.

Our correspondent is evidently over-anxious in these matters. He has been looking for mathematical precision, when moral equality is all that is necessary. To insist on measuring and counting each little atom would involve us in calculations that would make life unbearable and that can never have been contemplated by any legislator.

The standards of comparison have been supplied by numerous writers in the past, and are broad and liberal enough to remove all scrupulosity. As objects of vows, one confession has been declared the equivalent of one day’s fast; a promise of monthly confession for life as suitable as one of avoiding external sins of impurity; daily Rosary the same as weekly confession.¹ Examples like these are enough to cover the cases presented by ‘Confessarius,’ and they also give the principle followed by the Penitentiary, viz., that frequentation of the Sacraments may be taken as the equivalent of other works that, from a physical point of view, are much more difficult.

But, in connexion with vows, even broad rules of this kind will be much less necessary for the future. The reason is found in the facts underlying ‘Confessarius’ final query. We find it stated occasionally that Canon 1314, already quoted, has made no change in the legislation.² It must be admitted, however, that a change *has* been made—to the extent, at least, of substituting certainty for probability. The common, though not universal, teaching used to be, as our correspondent indicates, that ‘the commutation of a vow into something equally good ought to be made by ecclesiastical authority.’³ The reasons assigned were, 1°, that God is more pleased when a promise is kept than when something, equally good, but not promised, is offered instead; 2°, that, as St. Thomas teaches, a commutation involves a contract—which cannot be concluded without the consent of a person representing God’s authority on earth.⁴

¹ Cf., e.g., Reuter, ii. 374.

² See e.g., Marc, *Supplementum*, p. 901.

³ Idem., *Inst. Mor. Alph.*, i. 648 (1917 edition).

⁴ Ibid.

Whatever truth may underlie these statements, the general teaching must be abandoned, and our correspondent's text-books are out of date. For Canon 1314 makes it quite clear that, in the case in question, the commutation may take place without the intervention of any ecclesiastical authority.

For the future, therefore, when commutation takes place, it will be effected by the penitent himself in the first two cases: the confessor's authority will be necessary only when something less perfect is to be substituted. Now, it is an accepted principle in Canon Law that, whatever doubts may exist as to the meaning and extent of a new faculty, it should always be interpreted so as to convey at least *some* power. If, therefore, a commutation faculty is ever granted under the new regulations, it will apply to the third case, as a matter of course. And that will end our correspondent's perplexities. When he has fair reason for supposing that the work now proposed is at least as good as the one originally promised, he has only to tell the penitent that he can make the substitution for himself without the aid of any confessor. If he finds it clearly less perfect, he may use his powers without scruple; and if he is unable to decide, he may still employ them *ad cautelam*. In case his power is one of 'absolving' as well as of 'commuting'—as will likely enough be the case—he can proceed with still greater satisfaction. For, given a reasonable cause, he may remove the vow without substituting anything.

MARRIAGE CASE

REV. DEAR SIR,—Kindly let me know what you have to say about the following marriage in the next I. E. RECORD:—

A, a school teacher in England for nearly twenty years, in returning to her native home in Ireland on her vacation, tells her Rev. Manager that she intends to return no more, as she is going to get married in a fortnight to a gentleman in parish A, in an Irish city, and gets the necessary letter, as it were, from the Rector to do so. She remains nearly a fortnight in her native home, in parish B, where she was born and reared, and where she used to spend her vacations at least twice a year. After spending nearly a fortnight at home she goes to parish A, in the Irish city, and gets the parish priest of parish A to marry her on the strength of the English rector's letter. She tells the priests of her native parish nothing whatsoever about her marriage. She does not even get from them a letter of freedom. No doubt she gets her baptismal certificate, but states another reason. I believe the parish priest of parish A, if he knew the circumstances, should have said to Miss A, that she renounced her English domicile, that she returned to her native domicile, where she spent nearly the past fortnight, and that she should have made arrangements about the marriage with the parish priest of her native home in place of coming to this city outside her diocese.

In view of Canon 1023, § 2, the lady was quite right in getting letters of freedom from the English rector. But, as presumably she had not gone to England before the age of thirteen, the same canon requires that she should have got them also from the clergy of her native parish—and that independently of the question whether she retained her domicile there or not.

It would appear that, whether the marriage took place or not, she was not to return to the English school: so all speculations under the *Ea quae* chapter may be dismissed and the English connexion may be taken as abandoned.

The marriage was, of course, valid (1095). It was contracted in the parish of the bridegroom; therefore (1097, § 1, 2°), except for the absence of a letter of freedom from the bride's native parish, it was lawful also, 1°, if the lady was a *vaga*, or, 2°, if she had a 'just cause' for having the ceremony elsewhere than in her native parish (1097, § 2). The rule requiring marriage in the presence of the *parochus sponsae* is not very strict, nor need the 'just cause' be very serious.

We think she was not a *vaga*, that she retained her domicile in parish B. The matter is not an easy one to decide; so much depends on the circumstances. But so long as she regards her native place as her home, spends her free time there, is prepared to return if anything serious happen, and has not taken up any permanent condition of life incompatible with that attitude, the affirmative reply is the only one that can be reasonably given. Several Roman decrees confirm the view.¹

Our conclusions, therefore, are:—

1. That she should have had a 'just cause' for acting as she did.
2. That as regards the fees:—

(a) By general law they go to parish A. Permission from the native parish was not required (1097, § 1, 2°, § 3).

(b) By Irish regulation (October, 1908), parish B is entitled to the difference (if any) between the ordinary fee and the fee actually paid.

RETURNED SUBSCRIPTION

REV. DEAR SIR,—A testimonial was organized in favour of Caius. I was only slightly acquainted with him, and had at first no intention of subscribing. But I heard that a friend of mine, Petrus, was interested in the matter, so, on his account, when I was writing to him, I enclosed a subscription and asked him to add it to the fund. In reply I got a letter informing me that the list was closed,

¹ Cf., e.g., a reply given very fully in *Le Canoniste Contemporaine*, July, 1890, p. 292. The lady was in the same position as 'P.P.' describes. She had attained her majority, and her visits to her native place were few and far between. During one of them she was married in the presence of the parish priest. At that time the validity of marriage depended on its being contracted before the *proprius parochus*. She appealed afterwards for a re-validation, and the Penitentiary assured its 'dear daughter in Christ' that no re-validation was necessary—in other words, that she had retained her domicile.

and my cheque was returned. After a few days I discovered that the list was *not* closed, but my enthusiasm had died down and I did nothing.

When I spoke to Petrus about it he admitted the facts, and said he did not want to see me taxed in favour of a man I hardly knew. When I suggested that perhaps we had done Caius an injury, he was rather amused.

Several transactions in kindred matters have come within my experience. After one of them Petrus and I had a discussion, and agreed to ask you for your opinion.

In the case stated, was Petrus guilty of injustice? Or was I?

PAULUS.

We may leave 'Paulus' out of the discussion, except to congratulate him on having a tender conscience in the matter of justice. He had transferred ownership of his property to nobody, and need have had no scruple in resuming possession. Not to Caius, for *his* ownership would commence only when the money was handed to him. Not to Petrus, *he* was owner of no portion of the fund, only a friendly intermediary. If it be suggested that Petrus was guilty of injustice, and that Paulus co-operated, it need only be said that the co-operation was merely material and that the circumstances supplied a justifying cause. He had made up his mind to contribute in one way, and in one way only, namely, through Petrus as quasi-agent. That way he found impossible; and he was in no way obliged to change his mind and attempt other methods.

As for Petrus himself, some might be inclined at first sight to take a stricter view. They would ask whether injustice is not often committed when one interferes with another's chance of securing certain advantages, and whether, in this case, Petrus was not the obstacle.

They would admit, of course, that there are numerous kinds of interference that may take place without any injustice whatever. When we talk of a man's 'chance' of securing something, we must reckon, as elements in that chance, every legitimate means that may be employed against him. We all interfere often in this sense, and no one thinks of condemning us. When we recommend a trader, or praise his goods; we are interfering with his rivals' chances of trading with those who are influenced by our statements. If we advise a man to change his residence, or even to go on a journey, we are doing no service to many who would profit by his patronage or generosity in the meantime. And so of a thousand other cases.

The principle, then, they would grant, must be restricted to interference by means that are unjust. But, they would ask, is the case before us not one of the kind? Is a lie not unjust? And did Petrus not keep his friend inactive by his false statement that the list had closed?

We think not. The lie was, of course, unjust. But it was not the real means in the case, the real cause why Paulus did not subscribe. The real reason was found in the fact that, having paid his friend a compliment, he had no further interest in Caius or his testimonial. So much is that true that, even when he discovered that the list was still open,

his attitude was not influenced in the least. He says his 'enthusiasm had died down': he puts the matter mildly; he never had any enthusiasm in the matter—except for Petrus. And the result would have been precisely the same had the lie never been told.

This, we think, will be found to represent the attitude of all our experts. We may take Lehmkühl as an instance. Dealing with the case in which (as here) fraud has been perpetrated, not against the beneficiary directly, but against the would-be benefactor, he maintains that, in order to have the *result* unjust, the fraud must have been 'the cause *per se*, not the cause *per accidens*.' The distinction, he grants, is not always easily applied: but, in order to give some help in a difficult matter, he suggests the following test. The cause, he submits, will have been only accidental, if the person who would have conferred a benefit on another either, 1°, was not actuated principally by a desire that this other should be enriched, or, 2°, when nothing has yet been done, and when the fraud has been detected or the injustice terminated, is now unwilling to confer the benefit'—adding 'especially if both conditions hold.'¹ The statement covers our case exactly. The fraud (found in the false statement regarding the subscription list) was directed against Paulus, not against Caius. And *both* conditions are fulfilled: 1°, Paulus was not actuated principally by a desire to enrich Caius; 2°, after he discovered that the list was still open, he was unwilling to contribute to the fund.

To put the matter in a simpler way. Petrus was quite justified in saying, 'I do not want you to contribute on *my* account.' Once he said that, he knew, no subscription would be forwarded. He was, therefore, quite within his right in preventing the subscription. To avoid mention of himself he employed another formula. Whether that formula was justifiable on the principles of mental reservation or not is beside the point. The main thing is that the *effect* was justifiable; and it is to the effect that we must look especially when discussing problems of restitution.

NOTE.—'Scotus' writes about a matter on which we expressed our views in the March (1920) issue of the I. E. RECORD (pp. 235-7). If he follows them, he will probably come to the conclusion that the persons concerned are still Catholics, but are attached to an unlawful association. 'Administrator's' query will be dealt with in a subsequent issue.

M. J. O'DONNELL.

¹ *Th. Mor.*, i. 974: 'Si is qui tertio emolumentum collatus esset 1) hoc non intendebat principaliter eo fine ut tertius ille ditisceret; 2) si re adhuc integra, post detectam sibi fraudem seu finitam injustitiam nunc non nolit bonum istud eidem tertio conferre.—Saltem si utraque conditio obtinet.'

CANON LAW

THE POSSIBILITY AND EXISTENCE OF PURELY PENAL LAWS

REV. DEAR SIR,—Kindly solve the following question: *Paulus magno cum gaudio et majore cum lucro legem vulgo Volstead per duos annos infrungebat. Ex uvis vinum exprimebat, ex vino vinum adustum distillabat, et ex frumento permagnam spiritus frumenti quantitatem frabicabat. 'Lex Volstead' ait: 'est lex mere poenalis, non enim in conscientia obligat; poenam vero effugere potui, quid officiales amicos et benignos eis aliquid lucri tribuendo faciebam.'* Accusatus autem ab inimico mille scutata pro multa solvi, quam summum ope officialium amicorum occulta compensatione recuperavit.

N.B.—*Lex Volstead est contra vina et spiritus vitæ.*

Quæritur:

1. An detur lex pure poenalis?
2. Sitne lex Volstead pure poenalis?
3. Ad quod tenetur Paulus in casu?
4. Possitne Paulus propter multam solutam sese occulte compensare?

Gratias in futuro.

X. Y. Z.

1°. A penal law is one which imposes punishment on those who violate it. If the obligation in conscience which is imposed is disjunctive—either to observe the law or to accept the punishment incurred by its violation—the law is a purely penal one. This does not mean that the form of the law and its binding force in the external forum are always disjunctive; as a matter of fact, they are usually absolute, and the violation of the law is usually a juridical fault. Maroto expresses this idea thus: 'In the external forum it cannot be always affirmed that the obligation is merely disjunctive, as a matter of fact frequently the juridical obligation is absolute; therefore, if it is violated, there is a real juridical fault to which a real punishment also corresponds. When an obligation is imposed disjunctively by law, acceptance of the part, in virtue of which the law is said to be violated, is devoid of juridical fault, and hence the corresponding imposition of the other member of the disjunction can scarcely be regarded as punishment.'¹ The same notion is conveyed by Prümener's definition of a penal law as 'that which indeed really commands something to be done or to be omitted and threatens punishment on its transgressors, but does not wish them to be bound under moral fault. Juridical fault alone is imposed and then punished.'

¹ *Inst. Juris Canon.*, vol. i. no. 220.

Not a few of the older writers—Suarez mentions the most important of them when dealing with this question¹—denied the possibility of purely penal laws in the sense just defined. They were influenced mainly by the consideration that punishment necessarily supposes moral fault, and consequently, they argued, it was unjust to inflict penalties on one who had violated merely a regulation which did not bind in conscience. These writers, however, were misled by the too restricted meaning which they gave to the word ‘punishment.’ Taken in its strict sense, indeed, the term involves the notion of vengeance upon an evil-doer; but it has also a wider implication by which it denotes some inconvenience imposed by a legislator for a just reason, of course, but quite independently of moral fault. Although it is a commonplace amongst canonists and theologians that the word is susceptible of the latter meaning, yet it may not be amiss to quote in this connexion the 23rd Rule of Law in the Sext of Boniface VIII: ‘Sine culpa, nisi subsit causa, non est aliquis puniendus’; and also the following passage from St. Thomas: ‘Poena dupliciter potest considerari: *uno modo* secundum rationem poenae, et secundum hoc poena non debetur nisi peccato; quia per poenam reparatur aequalitas iustitiae, inquantum ille qui peccando nimis secutus est suam voluntatem, aliquid contra suam voluntatem patitur; . . . *alio modo* potest considerari poena, inquantum est medicina non solum sanativa peccati praeteriti, sed etiam praeservativa a peccato futuro, vel etiam promotiva in aliquod bonum, et secundum hoc aliquis interdum punitur sine culpa, non tamen sine causa.’²

Amongst moderns we have frequently heard the late Dr. MacDonald spoken of as one who denied the possibility of purely penal laws. We think, however, that he has been misinterpreted, at least, so far as his written views on this question are concerned. A perusal of his *Principles of Moral Science* shows that what he denies is their existence, not their possibility. We shall let him speak for himself:—

‘Here the issue is knit more definitely. It is admitted on the one side that a punishment in the strict sense cannot be justly inflicted unless upon one who has been internally guilty of a fault; and, on the other side, I have no difficulty in admitting that the penal clauses of a contract can be enforced against one who has not been guilty in the least. The question, then, becomes one of fact: is the penalty which is inflicted for the violation of these penal laws a punishment in the strict sense, or is it rather somewhat like the enforcement of a penal clause in a contract?’³

Whatever about Dr. MacDonald’s view, there are, undoubtedly, among recent writers, a few who hold the impossibility of purely penal laws.⁴ In addition to the argument based on the nature of punishment, they urge also that the imposition of an obligation in conscience is essential to the idea of law, that the command to do or to avoid something which

¹ *De Legibus*, lib. v. c. 4.

² *Summ. Th.*, IIa, IIae, q. 108, a. 4.

³ *Principles of Moral Science*, First Ed., p. 101.

⁴ Cf. Maroto, l.c.; Noldin, *De Principiis Th. Mor.*, n. 164.

a law contains necessarily implies, for those to whom it is given, the obligation to obey it. This, to our mind, is the most serious objection against the possibility of purely penal laws; it is not, however, by any means an insuperable one. It must be admitted, indeed, that a law imposes some kind of obligation or necessity to do what it prescribes; otherwise it may be a direction, advice, counsel, or something similar, but not a law. As we saw, however, a purely penal law does impose an obligation in conscience. It is true that it is a disjunctive or hypothetical obligation—to undergo punishment, if the act intended by the law is not performed or omitted—yet at the same time a real moral obligation. Very many writers see in this hypothetical obligation an adequate response to this difficulty, a sufficient verification of the bond or necessity essential to a law. The following passage from Noldin is fairly typical of this attitude:—

‘Every law intends some act to be performed or omitted; now, in order that the law may secure what it intends, it either prescribes the act and obliges in conscience to it, or it proposes the act and hypothetically prescribes the punishment, if, namely, the act is not performed or omitted. The proper object, therefore, of a penal law is the *punishment* which is to be undergone hypothetically, and which in this law is not the sanction of the law nor vengeance upon guilt, but a means by which the legislator urges his subjects to the act proposed and intended by the law.’¹

Personally, we do not feel satisfied that this explanation is quite complete, at least for all cases. As a rule purely penal laws are couched in the form of a command or prohibition to do something with a threat of punishment for disobedience; in this respect they do not differ, generally speaking, from moral laws. It is scarcely true, therefore, to say that the proper object of a purely penal law is the punishment threatened: it seems rather to be the act which is to be performed or omitted, just as in the case of moral laws. To complete the explanation, therefore, it seems to us recourse must be had to the notion of juridical obligation, or obligation of the external forum, as distinct from moral obligation, or obligation of the internal forum. These laws, whilst leaving the subject perfectly free, so far as moral fault is concerned, constrain him, however, to obedience in the external forum. This distinction between obligation in the internal and external forum is well recognized, especially in connexion with ecclesiastical punishments, and corresponds very largely with the distinction between moral and juridical fault. Purely penal laws, then, it seems to us, impose not merely a hypothetical moral obligation, but also an absolute juridical one; and this suffices fully for the necessity or constraint essential to the notion of law.

Those who deny the possibility of purely penal laws are, as we have already insinuated, very few in number; the overwhelming majority of Catholic philosophers, theologians, and canonists are on the other side²;

¹ I.c.

² Maroto, I.c.: ‘*Doctrina hodie communissima et certa tenet leges poenales non solum in jure civili sed etiam in jure canonico dari posse et ipsas de facto dari.*’ Cf. etiam Noldin, I.c.; Wernz, *Jus. Decret.*, vol. i. n. 112, nota 122, etc.

and there can be no doubt, we think, that this view must now be regarded as practically certain. The reasons for it may be gathered from the answers to the two great arguments for the other opinion. As we have seen, the penalty in these laws is only a punishment in the wide sense, and the hypothetical moral obligation and the absolute juridical one which they impose suffice for the necessity or constraint essential to law. Purely penal laws, therefore, are real true laws; and consequently they fall within the competence of the legislator who is not restricted in his choice as to the kind of law which he is to impose.

With opinion almost unanimous in this matter, it is unnecessary to quote authority; yet one cannot refrain from pointing out that St. Thomas recognized the possibility and existence of purely penal laws, as the following passage, dealing with the binding force of the rule in religious institutes clearly demonstrates: 'In some religious institutes, however, for example, that of the Dominican Order, such a transgression, or omission, does not bind *ex genere suo* under mortal or venial fault, but only to undergo the prescribed punishment; because in this manner they are bound to observe such regulations.'¹

2°. Granted the possibility of purely penal laws, it is not by any means easy to determine when laws are of this nature, and when they impose a direct and absolute moral obligation. The difficulties, though, are confined almost entirely to civil laws. Ecclesiastical legislators always intend to bind in conscience, unless the contrary is expressly stated; and the gravity of the obligation is usually proportioned to the gravity of the penalty. As a matter of fact, in practice, the rules and constitutions of certain religious institutes are almost the only ecclesiastical laws of this kind in existence. In regard to civil laws, however, the position is not so simple. Dr. MacDonald, whilst admitting, as we have seen, the possibility of purely penal enactments, seems to deny that any such really exist, for he asserts that the laws that are commonly regarded as penal really bind directly in conscience. His criterion is the public estimation. He maintains that judges and the public generally consider violations of these laws criminal and disgraceful acts, and the penalties by which they are repressed punishments in the strict sense. We shall give his own words:—

'The question, then, becomes one of fact: is the penalty which is inflicted for the violation of these penal laws a punishment in the strict sense, or is it rather somewhat like the enforcement of the penal laws of a contract? Ask yourself how is it understood by the judge who sentences a poacher or a smuggler, by the man who is sentenced, and by the public. . . . I have made up my mind that in both these cases—which are typical instances of what are understood to be purely penal laws—the common feeling is that there is not the least similarity between the poacher or the smuggler and the contractor. One is regarded as a criminal, but not the other; one is expected to hang his head, feel shame, and express sorrow for the offence he has committed; whereas the other

¹ l.c., q. 186, a. 9 ad 1.

has simply to pay out so much money and walk away with head erect.' ¹

The great body of moralists and canonists, however, hold that many civil laws are purely penal. When one is determining whether laws are of this nature or not, they insist on the following points being taken into consideration : 1°. The form of the law—if it is disjunctive it is presumed to be penal ; 2°. The matter of the law—certain laws, such as those for the preservation of morals, are presumed to be moral, while others, such as police regulations for the external order of the community, are presumed to be penal ; 3°. The common estimation ; and, like Dr. MacDonald, they regard this as, generally speaking, the most practical criterion.² Our personal opinion is that of the great majority. Even on Dr. MacDonald's own test, it is our experience that people generally, and God-fearing people too, do not regard as sinful the violation of many of our civil laws. As our present concern is the 'Volstead' law, the following passage from Sabetti-Barrett, regarding the civil laws of the United States, will prove helpful :—

'It cannot be said about our laws universally that they are merely penal. For certainly if the procedure of the legislators is examined, it is clear that not only do they not despise but that they consult the authority of God in making laws. They make the laws as men who know that the greatest bond of unity and obedience is the reverence due to authority. Since, therefore, the affirmative opinion with us is not founded on any such presumption, it must be said that the legislators wish to make laws in a way suitable and necessary to the Republic : this way, in very many matters, is to bind in conscience to act according to the law ; thus, for example, where the object of the law directly tends to promote the good morals of the Republic and to repress crime, . . . in these and similar cases the laws are by no means to be regarded as merely penal, but as really binding under sin and punishment.' ³

In the light, then, of all this, what is to be said of the Volstead law ? Is it purely penal, or does it bind directly in conscience ? Of course, we cannot speak with all the authority of one who is a resident in the United States, and who is intimately acquainted with all the circumstances which influence a decision on this matter ; for example, we can apply only in a very imperfect way the criterion of public estimation. In so far, however, as our knowledge goes, we are of opinion that this law is

¹ I.e.

² Lehmkuhl, *Th. Mor.*, vol. i. n. 211 (10th ed.) : 'In praxi autem attendi debet, quid communi sensu et recepta consuetudine, aut iudicii complurium virorum doctorum habeatur pro lege poenali, quid pro immediati morali : et secundum hanc communem vel probabilem interpretationem legum singularum obligatio intelligenda est' ; D'Annibale, *Summul. Th. Mor.*, vol. i. n. 207 : 'Quae sint leges pure poenales aestimari debet : 1, ex verbis legis ; 2, ex usu et receptis moribus ; 3, ex communi sensu Moralistarum' ; Palmieri, *Op. Th. Mor.*, vol. i. p. 301 : 'Judicium quo cognoscatur legem esse pure poenalem, est 1, ipsa forma legis quae poenam solum praescribat. . . . 2, Confert ad hanc interpretationem consuetudo et communis sensus.' Cf. etiam Lacroix, *Th. Mor.*, lib. i. n. 610 ; Noldin, I.e., et auctores generatim.

³ *Compend. Th. Mor.*, n. 114.

not a purely penal one, that it binds directly in conscience. The purpose of the legislators was to abolish the evils connected with the drink traffic, as exemplified especially in the saloon system, in other words, 'to promote the good morals of the Republic and to repress crime'; it is, therefore, eminently a law demanding an obligation in conscience. Moreover, those who were instrumental in having this law enacted—many of them the legislator themselves—were influenced very considerably in their action by religious ideas; if we understand the matter aright, the Volstead law is largely the work of the Methodist body, with whom Prohibition is practically a religious question. This constitutes another argument for presuming in the legislators the intention of imposing an absolute moral obligation; and, in the absence of any convincing argument to the contrary, I think we must presume that such an obligation exists.

3°. This and the following query take us outside our sphere as canonist and into that of the moral theologian. For the convenience of our correspondent, however, we shall indicate what seem to us to be the solutions, without entering into an elaborate discussion of principles. Well, we think that Paulus is not bound to restitution. He is certainly not bound by reason of his violation of the law, because it does not impose an obligation of commutative justice. His bribery of the officials results in a loss to the State of the fines which would otherwise have been imposed; but in accordance with a solidly probable opinion, neither he nor the officials are bound to restitution on this head, because fines are imposed not to enrich the treasury, but to punish crime.¹

4°. He certainly cannot make occult compensation: the fine is justly imposed and passes into the ownership of the State when paid.

THE SECOND YEAR OF THE NOVITIATE

REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you kindly answer the following queries in the next issue of the I. E. RECORD: Regarding the second year's novitiate, the Sacred Congregation of Religious, in a recent Instruction, prescribes, at No. IV (I. E. RECORD, p. 199, February) that 'novices, for two months before profession, should give up all external work; and, if they have been outside the novitiate house, they should be recalled to it':—

I. During these two months, may such novices be *also* engaged, with moderation, in study?

II. May they be allowed to visit their relations, for some days, during those two months, in case they could not do so during the year?

UN PRETE.

I°. The Instruction, to which our correspondent refers, and which

¹ Lehmkühl, op. cit., n. 1012, 5: 'Multa quae propter neglectum officium sive custodis non denuntiantis sive iudicis non condemnantis reo non imponitur, probabiliter a custode sive iudice titulo restitutionis non est solvenda ei, cui alias multa illa addicta fuisset: nam multa rationem justitiae vindicativae habet neque ad ditandum fiscum alterumve imponitur, sed lucrum alterius per accidens est; quare illius lueri non assecutio, qua lucrum est, censetur ex negligentia vel culpa iudicis, etc., per accidens sequi.'

was published in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* of November last, is practically the only general legislation on the second year of the novitiate. The Code, indeed, states that, if a second year is prescribed in the constitutions for the novitiate, it is not necessary for validity, unless the contrary is expressly declared in the constitutions; but it says not a word regarding the manner in which the second year is to be spent. The paragraph of the Instruction which bears upon our correspondent's queries is the fourth, and, for the sake of clearness, it may be as well to quote it in the original:—

‘Sive autem in domo novitiatus, sive extra, tyrones permanserint, duobus ante professionem mensibus ab omni opere externo abstineant, si extra novitiatum fuerint, ad illum revocentur, ut per integrum bimestre ad professionem emittendam, in spiritu suae vocationis formati, se preparent.’

In our opinion, moderate study does not come under this prohibition: *opus externum* is work, the primary object of which is the welfare of others. The language of the Code, which in Canon 565, § 3, draws a distinction between study and external works, confirms this view: ‘During the year of the novitiate the novices must not be employed in preaching or hearing confessions, or in the *external charges* of the Institute, or even in the *study* of letters, the sciences, or arts.’ The *Normae* also has a similar distinction: ‘In the second year of the novitiate they may engage with moderation in *study* and other *works* of the Institute, always under the direction and vigilance of the Mistress.’

II°. Explicitly, this paragraph of the Instruction commands that novices who are outside the novitiate house during the second year should be recalled to it for the last two months; implicitly, it requires that this period should be spent in the novitiate in preparation for profession. We are of opinion, therefore, that visits such as those contemplated by our correspondent are out of harmony with this regulation.

ARE HERETICS AND SCHISMATICS BOUND BY ECCLESIASTICAL LAWS?

REV. DEAR SIR,—May it be held that heretics and schismatics are not bound by those ecclesiastical laws which have the sanctification of the individual for their object, such as the laws regarding feasts and fasts? In the hypothesis that this is so, what is to be thought of Noldin's statement that Catholics may not induce them to violate such laws?

SACERDOS.

Before the publication of the Code many authors held that heretics and schismatics who were born and brought up in heresy and schism were not bound by laws whose primary object was the sanctification of the individual: they considered that the Church did not wish to urge the obligation in these circumstances. Personally, however, we always thought the other view more probable. Apart from exemption by the

Church, there is no doubt heretics and schismatics were bound by such laws; and there is really no proof that this exemption was ever granted, nor was any ever adduced by those who maintained that it had.

Some commentators on the Code seem to consider that its publication has not modified this controversy in the least: they simply state the pre-Code position and leave the matter there. We are of opinion, however, that the opinion favouring heretics and schismatics is now altogether devoid of probability. The Code deals expressly with exemption from ecclesiastical laws in Canon 12. Three classes are declared to be exempt: those who have not been baptized; those who have not attained the use of reason, even though they have been baptized; and those who have not completed their seventh year, even though they have been baptized and have attained the use of reason. Now, it seems quite clear that, if it was the intention of the Church to free heretics and schismatics from one big class of ecclesiastical laws, it should have been stated in this connexion; and the fact that it has not been so stated indicates that they remain bound in the same way as Catholics. The fact that this question is expressly dealt with, and that certain exemptions are expressly granted, forbids us to presume on other exemptions.

The passage in Noldin to which our correspondent refers is the following: '*Ex eo tamen, quod haeretici hisce legibus non teneantur, non licet inferre catholicos eis legum violationem suadere vel injungere posse, quia ecclesia non permittit, ut a catholicis ad agendum contra legem inducantur.*' We doubt very much the logic of this position. If heretics and schismatics were not bound by these laws, then we should fail to see why Catholics might not advise or induce them to act in opposition to them: in the hypothesis the acts of the heretics and schismatics would be, both objectively and subjectively, good, or at least indifferent.

J. KINANE.

LITURGY

QUERIES REGARDING INDULGENCES OF A CRUCIFIX, BEADS, A PRAYER, AND STATIONS OF THE CROSS

REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you be so good as to favour me with replies to the following queries:—

1°. A small metal crucifix bears the image of the Crucified embossed on each side. It appears to me that this is a defect in form. May such a crucifix be indulgenced? It is commonly taught that in the case of an indulgenced crucifix, the indulgences are annexed to the figure and not to the cross. In this case, where the aforesaid crucifix is alleged to be indulgenced, are both figures indulgenced? Is either figure indulgenced? Which of the two?

2°. In pre-Code days the unanimous teaching of authorities in this matter of indulgences, was that an object, viz., crucifix, rosary beads, etc., was indulgenced only for the owner of such indulgenced

object. Should A lend his indulgenced beads to B, the latter could not gain the indulgence attached to A's beads. Now, it would appear that the new Code (see Canon 924, § 2) has modified considerably the prevailing discipline. Is it so? For example: May A lend his indulgenced beads to B and may the latter gain the indulgences annexed to his beads? May B likewise pass A's beads on to C so that C also may, by using the beads, gain the indulgences attached to A's beads?

3°. One of the conditions usually laid down for gaining the indulgences of the Stations of the Cross is that the exercise should be continuous; in other words, that one should go round the fourteen stations without any notable interruption? Does this include all kinds of interruptions, even for the performance of other spiritual exercises? For example, might one interrupt the Stations in order to hear Mass, go to Holy Communion, and make his thanksgiving, and not be obliged to commence the exercise again at the first station?

4°. On many mortuary cards one sees the Prayer, 'O immense Passion,' etc., with an indication of 400 days' indulgence. Will you kindly say if the Prayer with the indulgence is authentic? My reason for doubting it is because I find no mention of such indulgenced Prayer in the *Raccolta*.

DUBIUS

1°. Our correspondent has kindly sent us a sample of the little indulgenced cross to which he refers. The embossing of the same image on each side of a cross or medal is very unusual, but we do not think the peculiarity militates against its suitability as an object for an indulgence. The Sacred Congregation¹ has declared that medals bearing images of saints on either side may be indulgenced, and we presume the same should hold for the sign of the Crucifixion, whether in the shape of a medal or a cross. But this little cross cannot be regarded as a crucifix in the proper sense, for something more than the mere embossing of the image of Our Lord is required. The indulgences of a crucifix attach not to the cross, but to the figure of the Crucified; so much so that it has been declared by the Sacred Congregation² that the figure of a blessed crucifix may be transferred to another cross without interfering with the indulgence. For crucifixes receiving the indulgence of the Way of the Cross we find it laid down³ expressly that the figure should stand out in relief from the cross: 'cruces cum imaginibus Domini nostri Jesu Christi crucifixi prominentibus'; and it has been declared⁴ more than once that a painted or embossed image will not suffice. We take it that the same applies to all concessions of indulgences specifically granted to crucifixes, whether it be the indulgence of the Way of the Cross, the plenary indulgence *toties quoties* at the hour of death, partial indulgences,

¹ Decr., Dec. 22, 1710.

² April 11, 1840.

³ Vide Beringer, vol. i. p. 356.

⁴ Ibid. p. 357.

or all three combined—for the properly constructed crucifix may be enriched with several kinds of indulgence. A crucifix, however, with a figure of Our Lord in relief on each side would be such an anomaly that we should need very positive proof, indeed, before believing that it had been endowed with any kind of indulgence.

If this little cross, then, has been indulgenced, we assume that the indulgences attaching to it are the usual Apostolic Indulgences, i.e., those special indulgences granted to blessed objects, e.g., a cross, a medal, or statue, by the Holy Father, either directly or through some priest to whom he has given the power. The list of those Apostolic Indulgences, which was first published by Benedict XIII, is renewed by each Pope, in practically the same terms, immediately after his coronation. If our correspondent will kindly consult the April issue of the *I. E. RECORD* (p. 428) he will see the complete list of these indulgences as announced by our present Holy Father, and also the conditions prescribed for gaining them; and if he has time at his disposal he may find it useful to compare the list of Pius XI with the corresponding concession of Benedict XV, granted on September 5, 1914.¹ The comparison will reveal at least two or three points of difference worthy of the attention as well of those who may receive the power² of granting such indulgences as of those who receive objects enriched with the Apostolic Indulgences of Pius XI.

(a) The first point of difference has reference to the objects to which Apostolic Indulgences may be attached. The concession of Pius XI reads: '*Res aptae ad recipiendam benedictionem pro Indulgentiis Apostolicis lucrandis sunt tantummodo coronae, rosaria, cruces, crucifixi, parvae statuæ, numismata, dummodo non sint ex stanno, plumbo, vitro aliave simili materia, quae facile confringi vel consumi possit.*' The corresponding condition prescribed by Benedict XV is more emphatic though less comprehensive: '*Excluduntur ab apostolicae benedictionis concessione imagines typis exaratae depictae itemque cruces, crucifixi, parvae statuæ et numismata ex stanno, plumbo, aliave ex materia fragili seu consumptibili confecta.*' In both statements we observe that paintings and engravings, and crosses, statues, crucifixes, and medals of *tin* and *lead* or any similar material that may be easily broken, injured, or destroyed, are unsuitable objects for Apostolic Indulgences. But note that the regulation of Pius XI includes chaplets and rosaries in its category and expressly mentions *glass* among the materials excluded from such indulgences, so that, according to this concession, chaplets and rosaries made of tin, lead, glass, or any similar material are not to be enriched with the Apostolic Indulgences. This is something quite new, for liturgical writers,³ relying on a decree of the Sacred Congregation, February 29, 1820, and on the wording of all previous concessions of such indulgences, held, that as chaplets and beads were not included in the above enumeration, they might be made of tin, lead, or even solid glass. What then of beads the grains of which are made of

¹ See *I. E. RECORD*, Fifth Series, vol. v. p. 317.

² Members of the '*Pia Unio Cleri*' have this faculty as one of their privileges.

³ Vide Beringer, vol. i. p. 330; Maurel, p. 256.

coral, pearl, amber, enamel, alabaster, marble, crystal? We write subject to correction, but we do not think they are excluded by the words 'vitro aliave simili materia,' provided they are of *solid* (not hollowed) *material*, as prescribed by the decree of February 29, 1820. With regard to concessions for the blessing of such objects by former Popes, it is made perfectly clear that they are not interfered with by the present regulation.

(b) Again, the list of indulgences granted in the concession of Pius XI is not exactly the same as that of Benedict XV or his predecessors. We note the following points: (1) The Feast of the Sacred Heart is included amongst the Feasts on which a plenary indulgence may be gained; (2) for prayers for the Pope's intention with contrite heart on days other than the special occasions mentioned, the indulgence is now 300 days instead of 100 days as heretofore; (3) instead of the particular indulgences granted for specific works, as in former concession, there is now granted an indulgence *toties quoties* of 500 days for any one of the works of piety or charity mentioned in the opening statement.

(c) For the devout examination of conscience and the *Pater Noster*, etc., in honour of Holy Trinity and the Five Wounds of Our Lord, there is now 300 days' indulgence, and for those who pray devoutly for the dying, an indulgence of 100 days.

(d) But the most obvious difference is the absence in the document of Pius XI of all reference to (1) the decree of Alexander VII, Feb. 6, 1657, (2) the decree of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences, June 5, 1721; and (3) the injunction drawn from the Constitution *Pia Mater* of Benedict XIV, April 5, 1747. These decrees were heretofore always referred to and reinforced in concessions of this kind, and we shall see in the reply to the next query that there is a significance attaching to their omission in that of Pius XI. What is the purport of those decrees? According to the decree of Alexander VII (a) the indulgenced objects are not to pass from those for whom they were blessed or to whom they have been first distributed; (b) if they have been lost they cannot be replaced by others at pleasure; (c) they cannot be lent to or given at the request of others for the purpose of gaining the indulgences—if this is done the indulgences are lost both to the lender and to him to whom they are lent. According to the decree of June 5, 1721, such objects cannot be sold after having been blessed and indulgenced. Hence shopkeepers and traders cannot arrange to have crosses, medals, and crucifixes and rosaries blessed and indulgenced, and afterwards sold, even though they charge only the ordinary price.

The Constitution of Benedict XIV provides for the welfare of the dying, according to different cases, giving the rite and formula for the blessing with plenary indulgence *in articulo mortis*, and each concession of indulgences heretofore prescribed that the blessing *in articulo mortis* should follow that rite, and warned those who assist the dying not to use for the purpose of a plenary indulgence one of the crucifixes indulgenced merely with the Apostolic Indulgences, *unless they had obtained in writing a special faculty for doing so*. This latter important injunction is entirely omitted in the new concession of Pius XI.

2°. Before replying to this query we shall quote two official pronouncements which have a distinct bearing on the subject. The first is from the new Code and reads as follows: 'Indulgentiae coronis aliisve rebus adnexae tunc tantum cessant, cum coronae aliaeve res prorsus desinant esse vel rendantur' (Can. 924, § 2): the second is a decree¹ of the Sacred Penitentiary, dated February 18, 1921: 'Utrum Canon 924, § 2, Codicis juris Canonici, juxta quem "Indulgentiae coronis aliisve rebus," etc., abrogaverit Decretum s.m. Alexandri VII, die 6 februarii anno 1657 editum, a singulis Summis Pontificibus initio pontificatum renovatum, et etiam die 5 septembris anno 1914 a Ss^{mo}. D. N. Benedicto Div. Prov. Pp. XV confirmatum, quo expresse declaratur indulgentias vulgo "Apostolicas" coronis aliisve rebus sic adnecti ut ne transeant personam illorum, pro quibus hujusmodi res benedictae fuerint, vel illorum, quibus ab istis prima vice fuerint distributae, atque ne pariter has res commodari vel precario aliis tradi possint indulgentias communicandi causa?' 'Sacra Poenitentiaria Apostolica, re mature perpensa, respondendum censuit: *Affirmative*.'

According to the new Code, therefore, indulgences attached to rosaries and other similar things are lost only when the rosaries or other such things are entirely destroyed, or cease to be, or are sold. They do not then cease if *the things are given or lent* to another, even for the purpose of gaining the indulgences. This is the teaching of all recent authorities² on the subject whom we have consulted and there would seem to be no reason to doubt the accuracy of the inference. The decision of the Sacred Penitentiary, stating that in virtue of this canon of the Code the decree of Alexander VII has been abrogated, is a confirmation of it, and places the matter, we think, beyond the region of doubt. If, then, beads do not lose their indulgences when they are given or lent to another for the purpose of gaining the indulgences—and there is no longer any prohibition of doing so—does it follow that those who use the borrowed beads gain the indulgences attaching to them? In our opinion they do gain the indulgences, provided they fulfil the other necessary conditions. The indulgences are attached to the beads—they are not personal—and they do not cease when the beads are lent to another; it should follow that they avail for anybody who uses them. The decree of the Sacred Penitentiary refers only to Apostolic Indulgences, but we think the same reasons apply to all indulgences attached to beads and crosses, etc., provided, of course, that in each instance the other prescribed conditions are fulfilled. Our reply, therefore, to this query of our correspondent is in the affirmative.

We now see the reason for the omission of reference to those several decrees in the document of Pius XI. The decree of Alexander VII has been omitted because it was already officially decided that it had been abrogated by the new Code. The decree of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences

¹ Vide I. E. RECORD, May, 1921, p. 543.

² Ferreres, *Comp. Theolog. Moral.*, vol. ii. p. 803; Arregui, *Sum. Theol. Mor.*, n. 856; C. A. Damen, *Theologia Mor., secundum doctrinam S. Alfonsi*, vol. ii. n. 1130; *Ephem. Liturg.*, October, 1920, p. 471.

(June 5, 1721) is not mentioned, because what it prescribes is sufficiently provided for in Canon 924, § 2, of the Code : and a reiteration of the warning drawn from the Constitution of Benedict XIV would be virtually a contradiction of what we have stated to be the present discipline, viz., that the indulgences attach to the crucifix, and that, therefore, no matter whom it belongs to, it may be used by a dying person for the purposes of gaining the plenary indulgence.

3. ° Yes, one of the conditions prescribed for gaining the indulgence of the Stations of the Cross, is that the exercise of the fourteen stations should be continuous, without any notable interruption.¹ Short interruptions, however, do not mar the unity of the exercise, and even longer interruptions, provided they are not due to profane occupations² but to other pious exercises, need not be a bar to the gaining of the indulgences. Beringer³ gives a definite answer to the question : ' Ces interruptions peuvent même être assez longues, si elles ne sont pas causées par des occupations profanes, mais par d'autres pratiques pieuses. Ou pourra par exemple, après avoir parcouru quelques stations, entendre le sainte messe, se confesser et communier, sans être obligé de recommencer le Chemin de la Croix.'

4. ° We have frequently seen the Prayer, to which our correspondent refers, on mortuary cards, but though we have diligently searched the recent edition of the *Raccolta*, and other official publications from the Holy See, wherein indulgenced Prayers appear, we have not been able to trace the authentic sanction of this indulgence of 400 days. As, however, only indulgences granted to the faithful in general are found in the *Raccolta*, and those obtained by particular confraternities, pious societies, and the like, are to be sought for elsewhere, we are not as yet prepared to offer an opinion as to the authenticity of this alleged indulgence, but we think the matter worthy of further investigation. Perhaps some of our correspondents would be able to throw some light on the matter.

BENEDICTION DURING THE ' FORTY HOURS ' AND THE ' DIVINE PRAISES '

REV. DEAR SIR,—I should be very grateful for a brief reply to the following questions in the I. E. RECORD :—

1. ° During the 'Forty Hours' Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, is it permissible to remove the Monstrance from the throne and give Benediction in the ordinary way?

2. ° In the circumstances is it lawful to conduct a Benediction Service, consisting of the *O Salutaris*, *Tantum Ergo*, Incense, Prayer of the Blessed Sacrament, the *Divine Praises*, *Adoremus*, etc., but omitting the actual blessing, the Monstrance not being taken from the throne at all? Would any cause justify this?

3. ° At the Exposition on Passion Sunday may the Deacon and Subdeacon wear the violet Dalmatic and Tunic?

4. ° May the prescribed Votive Masses in connexion with the

¹ Decr. Auth., 385 ad 1.

² Decr. Auth., n. 234 ad 4.

³ Vol. i. p. 281.

'Forty Hours' be said on the Monday and Tuesday following Passion Sunday?

5°. Is there any obligation to recite the Divine Praises at Benediction, or is their recitation optional? Might they be recited in Irish?

JUNIOR CURATE.

1°. We do not think it is justifiable to remove the Monstrance from the throne and give Benediction in the ordinary way during the course of the 'Forty Hours' Adoration, except at the close of each day before the Blessed Sacrament is exposed in the Tabernacle. The latter practice is recognized, as we see in the following decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, dated January 12, 1878. Q. 'An in expositione in forma Quadraginta Horarum permittatur singulis diebus sero, antequam Sanctissimum Sacramentum reponatur, benedictionem populo cum eodem impertiri?' R. 'Affirmative.'¹

2°. A 'Benediction Service' after the manner described is not a recognized liturgical service, and we are not aware of any cause that would justify it.

3°. Yes, provided the ministers do not leave the Sanctuary before the Exposition takes place.

4°. Yes; provided the rubrics otherwise permit. We would refer our correspondent to the last number of the I. E. RECORD (p. 545) for a fuller statement of the rules regulating the selection of these Masses, and the colour of the Vestments prescribed for each occasion.

5°. The recitation of the Divine Praises, which may take place either immediately before or after the actual blessing in the Benediction Service,² is not of obligation as far as the general law is concerned. If there is an obligation, therefore, in any particular diocese, it has arisen either from long established custom or through the prescription of the Ordinary.

The following excerpt from the recent decree³ of the Congregation of Rites prescribing that the *Praise* of St. Joseph be added to the list of Praises, indicates the meaning and purport of this pious practice: 'Ut piæ Laudi: *Benedictus sit Deus*, etc., vulgo *Dio sia benedetto*, etc. pluribus indulgentiis ditatae, quae, juxta monitum et exemplum Psalmistae et Ecclesiae: *Benedicam Dominum in omni tempore: semper laus ejus in ore meo*' (Psalm. 33, j) instituta est ad injurias resarciendas et amovendas divino Nomini sanctisque coelitibus potissimum per blasphemias et turpiloquia inlatas,' etc. The Praises may be recited⁴ either in Latin or in the vernacular,⁵ and the indulgences attaching to their recitation are as follows: (1) One year ('*toties quoties*') for each recitation; (2) two years when said publicly on the occasion of Mass or Benediction; (3) a plenary indulgence once a month on the usual conditions.

M. EATON.

¹ Decr. 3438 ad 4.

² Decr. 3237, 1; cf. De Amicis, vol. ii. p. 98.

³ S.R.C., February 22, 1921; cf. I. E. RECORD, May, 1921, p. 541.

⁴ Decr. 3237.

⁵ Provided it is a duly approved translation.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE PERRY PICTURES

REV. DEAR SIR,—Will you kindly allow me to make an announcement, in the I. E. RECORD, regarding the Perry Pictures? I have been trying for years to make these pictures known, by speaking of them and by sending around catalogues. They have become known only to the extent of causing me much trouble by way of correspondence; and I wish to state here what I have to say about them, and to give the address. The Perry Pictures are so called because an American philanthropist named Perry left a huge fortune for the purpose of putting in the schools for children copies of practically all the great masterpieces in painting. There are in all two thousand subjects. In addition, there are hundreds of pictures dealing with historical and geographical subjects; also pictures of birds, animals, minerals, and fruits, portrayed in natural colours. The catalogue will explain all, and is in itself educative as giving the names of the painters, and their works, under the different schools. These pictures are most useful for Sunday-school teaching. The price is one cent (a halfpenny) each for regular size; five cents for extra size (in sepia tone), and half a cent for the small size; and the Company pays the postage. The cardboard mounting will cost an additional cent. These were the prices eighteen years ago; and I am not aware that any change has since taken place. Catalogues will be furnished free on application to David C. Cook Publishing Co., Elgin, Illinois.—Yours truly,

P. A. BEECHER.

MAYNOOTH, *May 5, 1922.*

O DONNELL'S DAUGHTER MARY

REV. DEAR SIR,—In the February number of the I. E. RECORD of this year (p. 224) reference was made to the foundation, in 1508, of the Franciscan monastery of Dromahaire, Co. Leitrim. Dealing with another matter in the April number (p. 361) I indicated that a well-known chief of Leitrim, Tadhg O Ruairc, who died in 1605, was married to a sister of Aodh Ruadh O Domhnaill. A communication I have received from the Rev. P. V. Rudden, President of St. Patrick's College, Cavan, is of considerable interest as showing that this lady, whose name was Mary, was a patron of Dromahaire monastery, and presented it with a chalice in memory of her husband in the year 1619. This is how the relevant portion of Father Rudden's letter runs:—

'I herewith give you an inscription which is on a chalice now used in one of the churches (Butlersbridge) in Cavan parish: MARIA NI DOMNAILL

FILIA HUGONIS MAGONI PRO AIA THADDEI RUAIRO SUI MARITI ME FIERI FECIT MONASTERIO CHRIVELHAE 1619. . . . The stem and base are ornamented, but the cup is a plain one. The inscription, of course, is on the base.' There is a notice and an illustration of the chalice in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, under the article on 'Kilmore.' The words of the inscription are to be translated thus: Maire Ní Dhomhnaill, daughter of Aodh, son of Maghnus, for the soul of Tadhg O Ruairc, her husband, caused me to be made for the monastery of Craobh Liath in 1619.

Craobh Liath, or Creevelea, is another name for the monastery of Dromahaire. It was also known by the name of Carraig Phadraig. From this inscription we learn two new facts: (1) Tadhg O Ruairc's wife's name was Maire, and (2) the same lady was one of the two sisters to whom Fearghal Og Mac an Bhaird addressed a graceful poem some time after September 15, 1608. This piece commemorates the deaths of their four brothers, Aodh, Rudhraighe, Maghnus, and Cathbharr, and of their sister Nuala. It may be read in the original Irish in *Gleanings from Irish Manuscripts*, 108.

The history of the last chiefs of Breifne was particularly tragic. Brian na Murtha O Ruairc was one of the most gallant chiefs of the many gallant men in the Ireland of his day. He was obliged to fly to James VI of Scotland in 1591, and was basely delivered over by that sovereign to Queen Elizabeth a short time afterwards. He was tried and condemned in London, and his head impaled on London Bridge the same year. He left two sons, Brian Og, who established himself as chief in his father's place, and Tadhg Og, or Tadhg an Fhiona 'of the Wine,' who claimed to be the only legitimate son of Brian na Murtha. Towards the end of Tyrone's rebellion these sons were on opposite sides: inasmuch as Brian was an ally of the Irish leaders, Tadhg took up arms against him after the battle of Kinsale. Philip O Sullevan Bearra and O Mooney, the historian of the Franciscan houses in Ireland, speak in terms of great bitterness towards the younger of the two. Brian Og was ultimately ruined as a result of his share in the wars. On the submission of the northern chiefs, he besought a pardon and a grant of his father's estates on May 4, 1603, but King James' advisers would allow him neither. He died in Galway in January, 1604, and was buried, at his own request, in the Franciscan monastery of Rosserrilly.

In the January number I mentioned that Brian Og's wife was Maguire's sister. She lived till 1633, if not to a later date, and her name was Mary. Father Meehan, in his book on the Irish Franciscan Monasteries (fourth edition, p. 270), says a chalice presented by her to the friars of Donegal, was, in his day, in the possession of an Irish priest in Quebec, and recorded the facts here set forth.

We get a glimpse of two sons of this marriage in a State paper of May 18, 1624: 'There is a son of Brian Og O Rourke, a famous traitor that cut in pieces Sir Conyers Clifford, and was in the last rebellion in this country; his mother was Maguire's daughter, his eldest brother is a leader of the Irish regiment. [The writer] conceives this man to be a most dangerous imp, fit to be secured.' The Irish regiment referred to

was that in Flanders, wherein Henry O'Neill, Owen Roe, and many other famous men served.

Coming now to Tadhg, the younger brother of Brian Og: he was knighted early in James' reign, and on February 10, 1604, was granted a patent of 'the castles, lordships, or manors of Dromahaire, Leitrim, and Newtown, with all their rights, members, and appurtenances, situate in O'Rourke's country, with all the lands, tenements, and hereditaments which belonged to the late Sir Brian O'Rourke (executed 1591).' On March 6, 1605, the Lord Lieutenant reported that O'Rourke was likely soon to die, and that his country would fall into the King's hand through failure of male heirs. The Four Masters chronicle his demise under that year. He was buried in Dromahaire.

Mary, daughter of Black Sir Hugh O'Donnell, and wife of Tadhg, had previously been married to Sir Donnell O'Cahan, who became chief of O'Cahan's country in 1598. The latter nobleman, on his separation from Mary, daughter of O'Donnell, married Rose, daughter of Hugh O'Neill, about the time of his accession. In 1611 Sir Arthur Chichester stated that Sir Tege O'Rourke's children were said to be illegitimate 'by reason of their mother's marriage with Sir Donnell O'Cahane, from whom she was not divorced when Sir Tege took her and had these children by her.' This accounts for the Lord Lieutenant's reference to failure of heirs at Tadhg's death in 1605. However we are to explain the earlier separation, it is obvious the suggestion regarding Mary's children was made with a view to seizing on their estates.

Brian, Tadhg O'Ruairc's elder boy, was made a ward of James I in 1615, and was brought to England to be instructed in religion, and to have such education as was meet for a gentleman of his fashion and means. He was sent to the university, and was afterwards admitted to the Middle Temple; but ultimately found his way to imprisonment in the Tower. He had a young brother named Hugh. To their mother a proportion of 1,600 acres was assigned for the duration of her life. She was still in possession in 1631, when Viscount Gormanstown and another had a patent for the estate on the lady's death. Her benefaction to the monastery of Creevelea has led me to investigate her history and connexions thus far.—Yours respectfully,

PAUL WALSH.

ST. PATRICK'S COLLEGE,
MAYNOOTH.

DOCUMENTS

AUTOGRAPH LETTER OF PIUS XI TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF GENOA, ON THE INTERNATIONAL PEACE CONFERENCE HELD IN THAT CITY

(April 7, 1922)

AD R. P. D. IOSUE SIGNORI, ARCHIEPISCOPUM GENUENSIVM : DE INTERNATIONALI CONVENTU AD PACIS NEGOTIA TRACTANDA GENUAE COADUNATO

SSMI DOMINI NOSTRI

LITTERAE AUTOGRAPHAE

(Traduction.)

Du Vatican, le 7 avril 1922.

Vénérable Frère,

C'est avec un bien vif plaisir que Nous avons lu la lettre que vous avez si opportunément adressée à votre peuple à l'occasion de la Conférence Internationale, qui, dans votre glorieuse ville, réunit pour la première fois en discussion pacifique vainqueurs et vaincus, et vers laquelle se tournent les espérances générales des peuples.

Représentant du Dieu 'de paix et d'amour' qui de particulière providence *respicit super egenum et pauperem* et qui, par l'effet d'un jugement impénétrable, Nous a appelé si inopinément à recueillir, avec la succession au Suprême Pontificat, la mission de bienfaisance et de paix de Notre regretté Prédecesseur, Nous faisons des vœux, confiant qu'ils seront exaucés, pour que les délégués des Puissances veuillent bien considérer d'un esprit non seulement serein, mais encore tout disposé à quelques sacrifices sur l'autel du bien commun, la triste situation où se débattent tous les peuples. Ce serait à la fois la première condition pour y porter remède efficace et le premier pas vers cette pacification universelle dont tous ont le plus grand désir. Si dans le fracas même des armes, suivant la belle devise de la Croix Rouge *inter arma caritas*, doit régner la charité chrétienne, cela se doit vérifier davantage encore, une fois les armes déposées et les traités de paix signés ; d'autant plus que les haines internationales, triste héritage de la guerre, tournent au désavantage des peuples vainqueurs eux-mêmes et préparent pour tous un bien redoutable avenir ; car il ne faut pas oublier que la meilleure garantie de tranquillité n'est pas une forêt de baïonnettes, mais la confiance mutuelle et l'amitié. Et même en écartant, si l'on veut, de la Conférence toute discussion aussi bien sur les réparations imposées que sur les traités précédemment conclus, cela ne semble pas devoir empêcher tout échange ultérieur d'idées qui tendrait à faciliter aux vaincus le prompt accomplissement de leurs engagements ; ce qui finalement tournerait aussi bien à l'avantage des vainqueurs eux-mêmes.

Animé de ces sentiments d'égal amour de tous les peuples, que Nous inspire la mission à Nous confiée par le Divin Rédempteur, cette invitation que vous-même, Vénérable Frère, adressiez, exact interprète de Notre pensée, à votre peuple, Nous l'étendons à tous les fidèles, les exhortant à unir leurs prières aux Nôtres pour l'heureuse issue de la Conférence. Que la bénédiction du Seigneur descende sur elle et que des décisions qui y seront prises dans un esprit d'amour, comme Nous en avons la confiance, resplendisse sur la pauvre humanité cette concorde si désirée qui, unissant les peuples d'un lien de fraternité, soit de nature à les pousser de nouveau, après huit ans de douleurs et de ruines, sur le chemin lumineux du travail, du progrès et de la civilisation ; et que se vérifie ainsi l'idéal de l'Eglise qui, suivant l'heureuse expression de Saint Augustin (*De moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae*, I, 30) : *cives civibus, gentes gentibus et prorsus homines, primorum parentum recordatione, non societate solum, sed quadam etiam fraternitate coniungit*.

En même temps que Nous exprimons ce vœu fervent, Nous vous accordons à vous, Vénérable Frère, ainsi qu'au Clergé et au peuple du bien-aimé archidiocèse de Gênes, la bénédiction apostolique.

PIUS PP. XI.

CIRCULAR LETTER FROM THE SACRED CONGREGATION DE PROPAGANDA FIDE CONCERNING THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE 'MISSIONALIS CLERI CONSOCIATIO' TO BE HELD AT ROME IN JUNE

(April 1, 1922)

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE PROPAGANDA FIDE

LITTERAE CIRCULARES

DE PRIMO INTERNATIONALI CONVENTU CONSOCIATIONIS MISSIONALIS CLERI MENSE IUNIO INEUNTE IN URBE HABENDO

Quo centenaria commemoratio Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide (MDCXXII-MCMXXII) dignior atque sacris missionibus utilior evadat, visum est heic Romae primum internationalem conventum indicare *Missionalis Cleri Consociationis*, de qua Summus Pontifex fel. rec. Benedictus XV in Encyclicis litteris *Maximum illud*, diei 30 novembris a. 1919, haec inter alia habebat : 'Scitote igitur Nos cupere in omnibus orbis catholici dioecesis eam quam vocant *Missionalem Cleri Consociationem* institui, quae in dicatione sit Sacri Consilii Christiano Nomini Propagando, cui quidem S. C. omnem iam huius rei fecimus facultatem.'

Quod quidem iam a Summo Pontifice Benedicto XV in audientia diei II mensis novembris e. a. adprobatur, gloriosus Pontifex Pius divina Providentia Papa XI benigne confirmare ratumque habere dignatus est.

Diebus itaque I, II, III proxime futuri mensis iunii, mane tantum (ab hora nona ad hora primam p. m.), in aula magna Apostolicae Cancellariae praedictus conventus habebitur, hunc in finem nempe ut laudatae Missionalis Cleri Consociationis (vulgo : *Unione Missionaria del*

Clero) notitia, eaque certa et quibusvis dubitationibus libera, publice detur; mediaque praefiniantur ad eandem in omnibus catholici orbis dioecesis excitationem ac fovendam.

Praeses conventus erit Eñus ac Revñus Dominus Camillus Laurenti S. R. E. Diaconus Cardinalis, eiusque vices gerent R. P. D. Guido Conforti, Archiep. episcopus Parmen. et R. P. D. Iulius Tiberghien, Archiep. tit. Nicaenus.

Actuarius: Illñus et Revñus D. Caesar Pecorari, S. C. de Propaganda Fide Subsecretarius; eiusque vices geret Revñus D. Petrus Ercole, Secretarius Missionalis Cleri Consociationis in Urbe.

Consilium vero eiusdem conventus nonnulli Urbani Antistites nec non religiosi viri e singulis nationibus Romae degentes, constituent.

Cum itaque perplures catholici orbis Archiepiscopi atque Episcopi, proxime futuro mense maio in Urbem sint adventuri, occasione auspiciatissimi Eucharistici conventus, eos omnes per praesentes rogamus, iis non exceptis in quorum dioecesis supradicta Missionalis Cleri Consociatio nondum constituta fuit, ut adesse quoque velint eiusdem Piae Consociationis conventui ad sacrarum missionum bonum et incrementum; quod Ssño D. N. Pio divina Providentia Papae XI gratissimum apprime fiet.

Libelli seu tesserae pro conventu Missionalis Cleri Consociationis penes Secretariam S. C. de Propaganda Fide haberi poterunt.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, die prima mensis aprilis MCMXXII.

G. M. CARD. VAN ROSSUM, *Praefectus*.

✠ P. FUMASONI-BIONDI, Archiep. Diocletanus, *Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

'MOTU PROPRIO' OF PIUS XI REGULATING THE PROCEDURE ON THE OCCASION OF A CONCLAVE FOR THE ELECTION OF A POPE

(March 1, 1922)

MOTU PROPRIO

DE PRAESCRPTIONIBUS CONSTITUTIONIS PĀNAE 'VACANTE SEDE APOSTOLICA' ALIQUA EX PARTE INNOVANDIS

PIUS PP. XI

Cum proxime ex occasione Conclavis, in quo, arcano Dei providentis consilio, ad catholicae Ecclesiae principatum, nullis Nostris meritis, evecti sumus, omnia, quae ad Apostolicam Sedem vacantem et ad Romani Pontificis electionem pertinent, ad praescripta dirigerentur Constitutionis Apostolicae, quam s. m. decessor Noster Pius X die xxv mensis decembris an. MCMIV ediderat, ipsi VV. FF. NN. S. R. E. Cardinales in coetibus cotidie habitis, qui Congregationes generales praeparatoriae vocantur, optare se significarunt, ut posthac aliquod eius Constitutionis

caput sic mutaretur, quemadmodum rerum temporumque ratio postulare. Itaque, re attente perpensa, de Apostolicae Nostrae potestatis plenitudine, Motu proprio ac certa scientia, haec, quae sequuntur, decernimus atque edicimus :

I. Derogantes iis, quae in Constitutione Pii X *Vacante Sede Apostolica* tit. II, cap. I, n. 33 praescribuntur, ut Cardinalibus, qui longius absunt, fiat Urbem tempore adeundi facultas, decem dierum moram, quae, post diem obitus Summi Pontificis, ad Conclavē ineundum dabatur, ad quindecim solidos dies prorogamus ; praetereaque Sacro Cardinalium Conlegio potestatem facimus ingressus in Conclave etiam per alios duos tresve dies proferendi, ea tamen lege, ut decem et octo ad summum diebus elapsis, Cardinales, quotquot praesentes aderunt, statim Conclave ingrediantur et ad electionis negotium procedant. Quod vero attinet ad novendialia, servatis iis quae in memoratae Constitutionis tit. I, cap. v, n. 26 leguntur de exsequiis, tribus postremis diebus, sollemniori ritu persolvendis, Cardinales, in primo eorum conventu, praeferant dies, quibus sex priora habenda sint.

II. Quod in eadem Constitutione decernitur tit. II, cap. II, n. 38, ita volumus observari, ut cuilibet Cardinali, quamvis liberum sit duobus servientibus, clericis, vel laicis, vel uno clerico et uno laico uti, liceat tamen unum solum eumque laicum in Conclave secum adducere. Quod vero additur de servientibus Cardinali infirmo concedendis, id omnino immutatum esto.

III. Legem, quae de Communione a Cardinalibus facienda habetur in Piana illa Constitutione tit. II, cap. v, n. 54, sic novamus, ut liceat cuilibet Cardinali sacrum facere ; qui vero, quavis de causa, se a sacro peragendo abstinuerit, is in designato sacello et consueta Missa ad sacram Synaxim accedat.

Iubemus autem Nostras has Litteras Motu proprio datas legi coram omnibus S. R. E. Cardinalibus praesentibus, in prima Congregatione generali, quae post obitum Summi Pontificis habebitur. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuslibet.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum die I mensis Martii, an. MCMXXII, Pontificatus Nostri primo.

PIUS PP. XI.

AN INCREASE OF INDULGENCES IS GRANTED TO THE PIOUS UNION ENTITLED 'PIA UNIO EUCHARISTICA REPARATRIX' ESTABLISHED IN THE CITY OF MILAN

(December 22, 1921)

LITTERAE APOSTOLICAE

INDULGENTIIS AUGETUR PIUM SODALITUM SANCTAE UNIONIS EUCHARISTICAE
REPARATRIS IN CIVITATE MEDIOLANENSI

BENEDICTUS PP. XV

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.—Refert ad Nos Procurator generalis Carmelitarum Excalceatorum iam inde ab anno MCMXIV, auctore

dilecto filio Paschale Gatti, professo Tertii Ordinis saecularis B. Mariae Virginis a Monte Carmelo et S. Teresiae a Iesu, et probante Episcopo Cardinali, Albana in civitate, Piam fidelium Unionem initam fuisse titulo *Sanctae Unionis Eucharisticae reparatricis* potissimum ad finem promovendi frequentiam Communionum et orandi atque expiandi iuxta Nostram et Romani Pontificis mentem. Nos Ipsi frugiferam Unionem die prima mensis iulii superioris anni suprema auctoritate probavimus, eamque Carmelitarum Ordini credidimus, praesertim Archiconfraternitati sancti Foederis Eucharistici, quae Mediolani in ecclesia ad Ss^{mi} Corporis Domini sedem habet; eandemque Unionem in ea ipsa Ecclesia dilectus filius Noster Achilles Ratti, Cardinalis Archiepiscopus Mediolanensis, canonice erexit propriisque munivit legibus. Nunc autem cum enixae Nobis preces adhibitae sint, ut Unioni eidem peculiare nonnullas de thesauro Ecclesiae Nobis divinitus commisso indulgentias largiri de Apostolica Nostra benignitate dignemur; Nos, quibus memoratae Unionis incrementum maxime cordi est, optatis his concedendum ultro libenterque existimavimus. Quam ob rem, audito dilecto filio Nostro S. R. E. Cardinali Poenitentiario Maiore, de omnipotentis Dei misericordia ac BB. Petri et Pauli Apostolorum Eius auctoritate confisi, omnibus et singulis nunc et in posterum existentibus Promotori generali, zelatoribus et sociis inscriptis atque inscribendis in *Sancta Unione Eucharistica reparatrice* quoties sacram synaxim percipiant in spiritu reparationis et ad mentem Summi Pontificis, plenariam; itemque si singulis annis, Nativitatis Domini Nostri Iesu Christi, Circumcisionis, Epiphaniae, Paschatis Resurrectionis, Ascensionis, Corporis Domini, nec non Immaculae Conceptionis, Nativitatis, Annunciationis, Purificationis et Assumptionis Beatae Mariae Virginis Deiparae festis diebus, vere poenitentes et confessi ac sacra Communione refecti, propriam Unionis ecclesiam, si habeant, secus cuiusque curialem, a medietate diei praecedentis ad mediam usque noctem respectivae festivitatis visitent, ibique pro christianorum principum concordia, haeresum extirpatione, peccatorum conversione ac sanctae Matris Ecclesiae exaltatione pias ad Deum preces effundant, quo die iniuncta pietatis opera impleant, plenariam omnium peccatorum suorum indulgentiam et remissionem misericorditer in Domino concedimus. Zelatoribus autem ac zelatricibus dictae Piae unionis, quoties aliquem fidelem in Unionem ipsam inscribendum curaverint, iisdemque et reliquis inscriptis, quoties vel ad modestiam servandam in vestibus, in verbis et in operibus aliquem hortati fuerint, aut quovis modo offensionem in Deum impediverint, vel aegrotum ad Ecclesiae Sacramenta excipienda invitaverint, toties de poenaliu numero in forma Ecclesiae solita quinque annos expungimus. Promotori autem generali et zelatoribus sacerdotibus dictae Piae Unionis veniam impertimur, ex qua ipsi extra Urbem cruces, sacra numismata, coronas precatorias et parvas Domini Nostri Iesu Christi, Beatae Virginis et Sanctorum ex metallo statuas, sub unico Crucis signo servatisque servandis, in forma Ecclesiae solita benedicere queant cum applicatione indulgentiarum quae numerantur in elencho per typos edito sub die v mensis septembris anno MCMXIV, non exclusis, quod ad rosaria et coronas precatorias, indulgentiis a S. Birgitta nuncupatis et aliis quae a Patribus Crucigeris

appellantur. Iisdem quoque Promotori generali et zelatoribus sacerdotibus, dummodo ad sacramentales confessiones excipiendas sint probati veniam facimus, unico pariter Crucis signo, benedicendi Crucifixis, iisque applicandi plenariam indulgentiam, a quocumque ex fidelibus in mortis articulo constitutis lucranda, ad normam decreti Supremae S. Officii Congregationis die x mensis iunii anno MCMXIV dati. Ad haec indulgemus, ut Missae quae ad quodlibet cuiusque ecclesiae altare rite per quemvis sacerdotem adprobatum saecularem, seu, de Superiorum suorum licentia, regularem, celebrabuntur pro anima Promotoris generalis, zelatorum, zelatricum et sociorum enunciatae Unionis, ei animae pro qua celebratae fuerint perinde suffragentur ac si fuissent ad privilegiatum altare peractae. Tandem largimur, ut Promotor generalis et zelatores sacerdotes pro tempore existentes quater in hebdomada altaris privilegiati indulto gaudeant. Porro permittimus, ut, exclusa plenaria in mortis articulo lucranda indulgentia, Promotori generali, zelatoribus, zelatricibus, sociisque universis liceat plenariis supradictis ac partialibus indulgentiis functorum vita labes poenasque, si malint, expiare.

Praesentibus perpetuis futuris temporibus valituris. Volumus autem ut praesentium Litterarum transumptis, seu exemplis, etiam impressis, manu alicuius Notarii publici subscriptis ac sigillo personae in ecclesiastica dignitate vel officio constitutae munitis, ea prorsus fides adhibeatur, quae adhiberetur ipsis praesentibus si forent exhibitae vel ostensae.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum, sub anulo Piscatoris, die XXII decembris MCMXXI, Pontificatus Nostri anno octavo.

P. CARD. GASPARRI, *a Secretis Status.*

DECREE REGARDING THE BEATIFICATION AND CANONIZATION OF THE VENERABLE SERVANT OF GOD, JOHN NEUMANN, BISHOP OF PHILADELPHIA

(December 8, 1921)

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

PHILADELPHIEN. SEU BUDVICEN.

BEATIFICATIONIS ET CANONIZATIONIS VEN. SERVI DEI IOANNIS NEPOMUCENI NEUMANN, EPISCOPI PHILADELPHIENSIS, E CONGREGATIONE SANCTISSIMI REDEMPTORIS.

SUPER DUBIO

An constet de virtutibus theologalibus, Fide, Spe et Caritate in Deum et proximum, nec non de cardinalibus, Prudentia, Iustitia, Fortitudine et Temperantia earumque adnexis, in gradu heroico, in casu et ad effectum, de quo agitur?

Quod praeclara haec super heroicis venerabilis Servi Dei Ioannis Nepomuceni Neumann virtutibus Causa, quae perdifficilis visa fuerat solutionis, quaeque idcirco omnem fere spem progrediendi ad ulteriora deponere fuerat coacta, intermissum resumere potuerit actorum cursum eoque subinde adduci, ut optatum sortita iam fuerit exitum, hoc

intrinsicæ suimet bonitati acceptum in primis ipsa debet referre, postmodum autem Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Benedicto Papæ XV.

Qui inde a primo, quem, post promulgatum decretum super heroicis virtutibus venerabilis Servi Dei Ioannis Baptistæ a Burgundia, habuit, sermone, et alias deinceps, prout opportune monebat locus, in causis nominatim item super virtutibus venerabilium Servorum Dei Antonii Mariæ Gianelli et Marcellini Iosephi Benedicti Champagnat, quid sit, in quo christianorum virtutum consistere debeat heroicitas, Angelici Doctoris maxime innixus doctrina, et Benedicti XIV, sacri huius fori magistri, Suique in Bononiensi sede et in Petri cathedra, immortalis memoriæ Prædecessoris, fretus auctoritate e proposito est persecutus; ex eisque, quibus heroica virtus coalescit, elementis, quodnam præcipuum sit habendum adeo, ut sine illo nulla dari possit heroicitas, enucleavit posuitque in aperto; illudque in una dumtaxat situm sit oportet fideli, iugi et constanti proprii status munerum et officiorum perfunctione. Quumque præfato potissimum ex capite ista, quæ super heroicis pariter virtutibus, abhinc decennium et ultra, inita fuit disceptatio, in non paucas inciderit difficultates dissentientesque experta fuerit amplissimos sacri huius Ordinis suffragatores, optime se gessit egregius, quem causa nacta fuit, Patronus, cum quæ, tam claro tamque excelso admoto et prælucente lumine, commonstrata sibi fuerat, eam animo magno, confidenti et alacri ingressus est viam. Hæc namque, dum in altera præparatoria Congregatione ad ulteriora pandidit aditum, in postremo, quod proxime subsecutum est, certamine peperit victoriam; quandoquidem quæ duo, sive circa probationum instructum sive circa totius Causæ summam, præstanda erant, hæc præstitisse dicendi sunt actores.

Sane, quæ in medium proferuntur probationes, dotibus a iure requisitis esse præditas, clare, distincte et explanate iidem ostendere, suo præeunte sedulo experrectoque Patrono, connisi fuerunt actores, quippe qui oblatam sibi nullam siverunt elabi occasionem, quin caute patienterque, semel iterumque adnotarent, facta, quæ paulo ante describenda curaverant, ab oculatis enarrari testibus, eisque auritos quandoque accedere nec non documenta, sicut nempe statuunt iubentque conditæ leges. Hac via et ratione iustum atque legitimum causæ præsto esse iuridicum fundamentum, planum facere dum sategerunt illi, insimul ad heroicarum virtutum, de quibus in præsentiarum agitur, necessariam accurandam probationem animum viresque suas converterunt. Quo autem facilius quis posset æquo iustoque pretio singula aestimare facta, quæ iudicialibus consignata sunt tabulis, hoc aptissimum ipsis visum est consilium, illudque propterea exsecuti constanter fuerunt; videlicet res a Dei Famulo gestas sic distribuere, ut unicuique vitæ stadio variisque ab eodem susceptis et adimpletis muneribus officiisque propria responderet peculiaris quædam factorum series. Quod quidem quantum contulerit ad rectum de heroicitate virtutum exercendum iudicium, exinde dignoscere fas est fermeque dimetiri, quod scilicet necessitate quadam factum sit, ut, nonnisi habita ratione circumstantiarum, iudicium ipsum, prout eiusdem fert flagitatque natura, instituere datum fuerit atque absolvere. Ex eadem insuper inita servataque disceptationis

methodo illud etiam percommode contigit, ut perspicuum quoque fieret quae quotque in christianae perfectionis itinere, quod mature admodum venerabilis Ioannes Nepomucenus arripuerat, de die in diem, de virtute in virtutem fecerit ille progressionem; in ista enim animi comparatione, qua quis movetur ad perfecte agendum, omnem manifesto se prodere heroicam virtutem, communiter theologi docent atque sacrorum canonum interpretes; accommodataeque suadent haec celebris Rosignolii verba: *Ratio conservandae virtutis est eius perpetuus usus et exercitatio; est enim virtutis talentum illud evangelicum, quod nullo modo otiosum relinqui permittit Deus, Quare, ut obeantur virtutum officia, summopere vigilandum est, omnisque, quae offertur, occasio, avide arripienda; siquidem in virtutis curriculo qui non pergit, regreditur* (apud Benedict. XIV, lib. III, cap. XXI, num. 11).

Ita, allatis iterum et prope probeque inspectis Famuli Dei actionibus et operibus, eorumque agnita praesertim et congrua statuta aestimatione, iuxta criteria a Benedicto XIV aliisque scriptoribus in hac peculiari rerum disciplina peritissimis, tradita, nedum, contra atque prima fronte videri potuit, planam et expeditam sese perhibuit causae huius diiudicatio, verum et, quibus eadem intus pollebat et pollet, emergerunt apertamque in lucem prodierunt praestantia atque dignitas. Quamobrem, huc quum deductus sit sermo, benemerentissimae Congregationi Sanctissimi Redemptoris licet gratulari, utpote quae, recentior potius quum esset aetate, praeter Parentem legiferum Ecclesiaeque Doctorem, virum nomine et sanctitate celeberrimum, Alfonsum Mariam de Ligorio, duobus quoque suis gloriatur alumniis, quibus supremi Sanctorum iam decreti sunt honores, sanctis nimirum Gerardo Maiella et Clemente Maria Hofbauer, aliisque non paucis ex eadem legiferi Patris disciplina profectis eiusque spiritu imbutis et eruditis, quorum penes sacram ritum Congregationem beatificationis agitantur Causae, eosque inter venerabilis exstat atque eminet Ioannes Nepomucenus Neumann, cuius de heroicis virtutibus, plures ante annos, institutae quaestioni strenue invicteque decertantes, bene adiuvante Deo, evicerunt actores, ut tandem finem imponeret generalis, quae, die vigesima nona superioris mensis, coram Sanctissimo Domino nostro coacta fuit Congregatio. In qua a Reverendissimo Cardinali Antonio Vico, Causae Relatore, sequens ad discutiendum propositum est dubium: *An constet de virtutibus theologalibus, Fide, Spe et Caritate in Deum et proximum, nec non de cardinalibus, Prudentia, Iustitia, Fortitudine et Temperantia, earumque adnexis venerabilis Servi Dei Ioannis Nepomuceni Neumann, in gradu heroico, in casu et ad effectum, de quo agitur?* Reverendissimi Cardinales et Patres Consultores suas ex ordine protulerunt sententias, quibus tamen laeto intentoque animo auditis et perpensis, Sanctissimus Dominus noster supremum Suum iudicium de more prorogandum duxit, cunctosque, qui aderant, est adhortatus, ut interea Secum funderent preces, ad supernum promerendum auxilium, quod caelestis consilii Eum efficere compotem. Quumque postmodum mentem Suam patefacere statuisset, hodiernam elegit diem Dominicam tertiam Adventus, quae a recurrente Missae introitu nomen habet *Gaudete*. Ea propter, Sacris devotissime operatus, ad Vaticanas aedes arcessiri iussit Rever-

endissimum Cardinalem Antonium Vico, Episcopum Portuensem et S. Rufinae, sacrae rituum Congregationi Praefectum Causaeque Relatorem, una cum R. P. Angelo Mariani, Fidei promotore generali, meque insimul infrascripto Secretario, eisque adstantibus, solemniter pronuntiabit : *Constare de virtutibus theologalibus, Fide, Spe et Caritate in Deum et proximum, nec non de cardinalibus, Prudentia, Iustitia, Fortitudine et Temperantia, earumque adnexis, venerabilis Servi Dei Ioannis Nepomuceni Neumann, in gradu heroico, in casu et ad effectum, de quo agitur.*

Hoc decretum publici iuris fieri, et in acta sacrorum rituum Congregationis referri mandavit tertio idus decembres anno MCMXXI.

✠ A. CARD. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,
S. R. C. Praefectus.

L. ✠ S.

ALEXANDER VERDE, *Secretarius.*

DECLARATION OF THE PONTIFICAL BIBLICAL COMMISSION REGARDING THE ADDITION OF VARIOUS READINGS IN EDITIONS OF THE VULGATE

(November 17, 1921)

ACTA OFFICIORUM

COMMISSIO PONTIFICIA DE RE BIBLICA

DECLARATIO

DE ADDITIONE VARIARUM LECTIONUM IN EDITIONIBUS VERSIONIS VULGATAE
NOVI ET VETERIS TESTAMENTI

In Praefatione ad Lectorem editionis Clementinae versionis Vulgatae Sacrarum Scripturarum legitur :

‘ Porro in hac editione nihil non canonicum . . . nullae ad marginem concordantiae (quae posthac inibi apponi non prohibentur) nullae notae, nullae variae lectiones, nullae denique praefationes. . . Sed sicut Apostolica Sedes industriam eorum non damnat, qui concordantias locorum varias lectiones, praefationes S. Hieronymi et alia id genus in aliis editionibus inseruerunt; ita quoque non prohibet, quin, alio genere characteris, in hac ipsa Vaticana editione eiusmodi adiumenta pro studiosorum commoditate atque utilitate in posterum adiciantur; ita tamen, ut lectiones variae ad marginem ipsius textus minime adnotentur.’

Quum autem sint qui putent ultimis hisce verbis prohiberi additionem variarum lectionum non solum in margine laterali, verum etiam in inferiore seu ad calcem textus, quaesitum est a Pontificia Commissione Biblica : utrum liceat in editionibus versiones Vulgatae tam Novi quam Veteris Testamenti lectiones variae aliave huiusmodi studiosorum adiumenta ad calcem textus adicere ?

Re examinata, Pontificia Commissio Biblica respondit :

Affirmative.

Quam resolutionem Ss̃mus Dominus Noster Benedictus Pp. XV in audientia diei 17 novembris 1921 adprobare dignatus est.

✠ HENRICUS LAURENTIUS JANSSENS, O.S.B., Ep. Bethsaiden.
Consultor ab Actis.

REVIEWS AND NOTES

THOTH: THE HERMES OF EGYPT. A Study of Some Aspects of Theological Thought in Ancient Egypt. By Patrick Boylan, M.A., Professor of Eastern Languages, University College, Dublin, and Professor of Scripture, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. Oxford University Press: Humphrey Milford.

THE publication of his *Commentary on the Psalms* was the outcome of Dr. Boylan's work as Professor of Sacred Scripture in Maynooth. The present study is representative of his work as Professor of Eastern Languages in University College, Dublin. Both show him to possess a really scholarly knowledge of his subjects, and a masterly power of clear exposition. The work on the Psalms makes appeal to every student of Sacred Scripture. The work under review is addressed to specialists in Egyptology. There are few such in Ireland, and it is to the credit of Dr. Boylan that, practically speaking, he is the first Irish scholar to contribute substantially to the growth of Egyptological research. In an appreciative review of Dr. Boylan's work in the Literary Supplement of *The Times*, the reviewer refers to a few Irish scholars, such as Dr. Mahaffy, who casually touched on Egyptological themes. We should like to add in this connexion the name of Le Page Renouf, who, though not an Irishman, was one of the distinguished band of Professors chosen by Newman for the teaching staff of the Catholic University.

It would be impossible to enter in detail into the development of the Thoth legend as described in Dr. Boylan's book. Suffice it to say that the study illustrates in a clear and convincing way the methodology underlying the growth of the Egyptian cults. We see how a merely local cult may be enriched and enlarged by its inclusion in some dominant one such as that of Osiris or of Horus, and we see also the non-theological factors, social, political, which may bring this inclusion about. Thoth originally stood outside the Heliopolitan group of gods. To quote Dr. Boylan: 'It has been shown above that Thoth anciently stood outside the Heliopolitan group of gods, and that he was not one of the actors in the primitive Osirian drama, but was brought into it in a more or less secondary fashion. Hence it is reasonable to infer that the cult of Thoth was known in Egypt previously to the Pyramid age and previously even to the growth and spread of Osirian religion. It is not possible, however, to determine where Thoth had his most ancient shrine. The "Place of Thoth" referred to in Pyr. 1271 cannot be located by any other Pyramid reference. It is probable that in the early dynastic period—possibly even in the pre-dynastic period—Thoth had already several cult-centres.'

The subject of the present essay had already been treated by the

Russian scholar Turayeff, in a work published in 1898. Apart from the inaccessibility of his work, the progress of Egyptological research since then gave an opportunity for a new handling of the theme. In seizing the opportunity Dr. Boylan has had the advantage of the assistance of such a distinguished Egyptologist as Professor Erman, through whose kindness he obtained permission to make free use of the material which had been gradually accumulated for the Berlin 'Wörterbuch.' Dr. Boylan has taken full advantage of this permission, and has, as a result, given us in this 'Study' a work which is a solid contribution to Egyptological textual and theological research.

P. M. MACSWEENEY.

DAUGHTERS OF BANBA. By Mrs. Thomas Concannon, M.A. Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.

At first sight this book would give the impression of an attempt to re-write the history of Ireland from the Feminist point of view. Historical research is largely dependent on pre-occupations as the Imperialists and Socialists have, according to their lights, made abundantly clear of late years : so why should not the Feminists put us in possession of their perspective ? With the suffrage granted, the future is theirs ; but they would remind us that the past was theirs, too, though male historians entered on a conspiracy to write up only their own sex.

A first glance is, however, proverbially defective, and further reading showed that Mrs. Concannon's work is singularly free from any narrow Feminist bias. Her object is 'to supplement the knowledge of Irish history contained in ordinary text-books by bringing into greater relief the figures of some of her women.' Her aim is constructive, not destructive : to re-create for us the atmosphere of the old Gaelic family-life, how it faced 'the riddles of love and pain and death,' how it worked out its distinctive ideals and culture.

Mrs. Concannon has the gift of weaving the romance of poetry into the hard texture of historical fact. She is a most thorough and painstaking student and has sought far and wide into the nooks and crannies of our unexplored historical possessions. The bare material so arduously acquired is clothed with a realism and sure sympathy which makes the men and women of these days live for us again. The authoress has a keen perception of the perennial appeal of the human element ; it is this feeling for the primal realities of life which gives such vital freshness to her presentation of the dull facts of the annalists. From 'the Women of the Irish Sagas' to 'the Women of the Wars,' from Medbh to Grainne Ni Mhaille, she has traced, in exquisite miniatures, the living history of the Gael.

This work is a fitting prelude to the *Women of Ninety-Eight*. Those who have read that delightful book will need no recommendation to this. Mrs. Concannon has established a reputation for sound historical work : in these books she proves herself a writer of great insight and sympathy. We recommend this book as an example of how Irish history can be written.

M. J. B.

THE ART OF INTERESTING: ITS THEORY AND PRACTICE. By Rev. Francis P. Donnelly, S.J. London: Harding and More.

FATHER DONNELLY'S name is already familiar as the writer of several popular spiritual books. His aim in the present work is chiefly to help preachers to compose and deliver more impressive sermons, and, indirectly, to save congregations from the soporific effect of wearisome, useless discourses. 'It will have been noticed,' he says, 'that tiresome sermons are found where imagination is lacking' (p. 13); and later on he gives the reason, 'because, in eloquence truth must pass from the mind through the imagination to the heart' (p. 48). By imagination, Father Donnelly does not mean the faculty of dreaming dreams and seeing visions, but the power of clothing abstract truths with flesh and blood and making them appear actual and attractive. St. Paul is the model which he particularly proposes as an example of the directness of speech and of the aptness of imagery which should characterise a really good sermon. He shows that in the academic style of Newman, as well as in the popular style of Father Pardou, the imagination played an essential part. But that much more than the faculty of imagination is required to produce a discourse that will be talked about is evident from the following recipe which he gives on p. 95: 'What, then, will get your sermon beyond the church door into the paper and perhaps into a book? . . . Here is what you will have to do: Know the prejudices of the audience, if possible. They will remember what they like. Enlist the prejudices in your favour. Embody your truth in a story; illustrate it with a comparison; condense it into an epigram; reiterate it with persistency. Gather historical facts with which to prove it. Show that what you defend is a living actual issue in the scientific, moral or religious world of to-day. Then, if you have a clear order, and enforce what you say with sincerity, displayed in the flash of the eye, the swing of the arm, and the ring of the voice, your truth will abide.'

Father Donnelly's outlook is naturally American, and it is hardly to be expected that we, in this slow old world of ours, would accept unhesitatingly all his opinions and suggestions. One point which will evoke a protest from many readers is his severe, sarcastic strictures on the conventionalities of pulpit language. 'Neither the Gospels,' he says, 'nor the Epistles are conventional and trite, for the very good reason that they used a language understood by the audience. The tiresome speaker will use the same illustration for every audience and for all time. Christ likened Himself to a ladder upon and down which the angels travelled. [We cannot recall any such similitude.] Conventionality objects to comparing Him to a locomotive. Christ called Himself a lamp. [Where and when?] Conventionality shudders at an electric lamp. Cast spears, shoot arrows in sermons; but do not discharge rifles' (p. 8).

To modernize the similitudes of the Gospels in the way Father

Donnelly seems to suggest is (*in insipientia dico*) akin to irreverence. The words of a Billy Sunday may attract large audiences and be read with avidity in the daily papers, but, for a spiritual effect, the words of Scripture are unique because divine. Besides (*ut minus sapiens dico*) there are more laudable ways of avoiding tiresomeness than that of parodying the most beautiful and touching of Our Lord's parables. Yet Father Donnelly quotes with appreciation the following incident: 'You will be more certain of avoiding tiresomeness if you will do as the late Father Van Rensalaer did once in Boston. He told to the men the story of a Boston Prodigal, sobering up in New York and looking up Father Van Rensalaer for car-fare to take him home. The sermon was not tiresome, and no doubt many who heard the preacher then could tell you the parable to-day' (p. 11). No doubt, and we hope that many of those many did not test the sincerity of the preacher by asking the kindly Father for their car-fare! We are the more surprised at those suggestions because, in the chapter on Novelty or Eccentricity, Father Donnelly lays down principles which condemn them. 'No one,' he says, 'can fail to sympathize with the ambition of those who would galvanize fossil conventionalities with new life, but every one must earnestly desire that these misguided energies be directed into proper channels' (p. 199). 'The writer or speaker must indeed put his thoughts in a new way, if he would interest. But he must have novelty without distraction, and he must not abuse his medium on its material or on its formal side' (p. 206). 'Many of the fads and vagaries in all modern arts are the outcome of, desperate attempts at originality by straining the artistic medium' (p. 211).

We have dwelt on this one point because of the *outré* nature of the suggestion. Apart from it, the work conveys valuable and practical instructions on the need of, and on the means of, infusing life and animation into the spoken word.

THE STORY OF LOURDES. By Rose Lynch. London: Sands & Co.

THIS is not a book written after a hurried pilgrimage with the help of guide-books. On the contrary, it is the work of a lady who has been frequently in Lourdes, who has spent six months at a time there, who is able to converse fluently with the people, and who counted among her personal friends the brother of Bernadette, Mother Marie of the convent where Bernadette was educated, Mother Theresa who was in the novitiate with Bernadette, old Jean who was close to Bernadette at the Ninth Apparition and who for forty years looked after the Grotto, and Dr. Cox, the well-known English doctor, whose daughter was miraculously restored to health, and who thereupon, twenty-five years ago, gave up his London practice and attached himself to the Medical Bureau of Lourdes, which examines and registers the cures.

A work written by one so versed in the history of Lourdes deserves recognition. Miss Lynch tells the story of the Grotto with a delightful simplicity and vividness. Besides the account of Bernadette and the Apparitions of her 'Beautiful Lady,' there is a description of the three churches, of the wonderful Stations of the Cross, of the attention paid to the sick, of some of the miracles, and of the Irish pilgrimage in 1913. The book is small in size; but if you want a story of Lourdes which you will read with pleasure and satisfaction, get this little work by Miss Rose Lynch.

D.

BOOKS, ETC., RECEIVED.

America : A Catholic Review (May).

The Ecclesiastical Review (May). U.S.A.

The Rosary Magazine (May). Somerset, Ohio.

The Catholic World (May). New York.

The Austral Light (April). Melbourne.

The Ave Maria (May). Notre Dame, Indiana.

The Catholic Bulletin (May). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.

The Irish Monthly (May). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.

The Month (May). London : Longmans.

Études (May). Paris : 12 Rue Oudinot (VII^e).

Revue Pratique d'Apologétique (May). Paris : Beauchesne.

The Fortnightly Review (May). St. Louis, Mo.

The Lamp (May). Garrison, N.Y.

Revue des Jeunes (May). Paris : 3 Rue de Luynes.

The 'Summa Theologica' of St. Thomas Aquinas. Translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province. QQ. CLXXI-CLXXXIX. London : Burns, Oates and Washbourne.

De Re Morali (Editio Altera). Auctore Sac. J. B. Pagoni. Novariæ : Ex offic. Typ. E. Cattaneo.

BX 801 .I68 1922 SMC
The Irish ecclesiastical
record 47085658

Does Not Circulate

BOT
2003
17
v.19

